R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 769 AC 002 427

A STUDY OF NIGHT SCHOOL DROP-OUTS, A SCHEDULE 10 PROJECT.

BY- ALAM, MUBARKA WRIGHT, E.N.
TORONTO BOARD OF EDUCATION (ONTARIO), RES. DEPT.

PUB DATE MAR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.52 111P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DROPOUT CHARACTERISTICS, *NIGHT SCHOOLS, *PUBLIC SCHOOL ADULT EDUCATION, *DROPOUT RESEARCH, *QUESTIONNAIRES, LITERATURE REVIEWS, RESEARCH DESIGN, AGE DIFFERENCES, OCCUPATIONS, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, MOTIVATION, ATTITUDES, MARITAL STATUS, ADULT DROPOUTS, COURSE CONTENT, TORONTO,

A STUDY OF NIGHT SCHOOL STAYINS AND DROPOUTS (PERSONS WHO MISSED CONSECUTIVE CLASSES) USED A RANDOMLY SELECTED SAMPLE OF 240 STAYINS AND 243 DROPOUTS FROM THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO (ONTARIO) BOARD OF EDUCATION EVENING CLASSES. INTERVIEWS WERE GUIDED BY QUESTIONNAIRES BUILT TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FINDINGS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH. BOTH CODING CATEGORIES AND OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS WERE USED. IT WAS FOUND THAT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STAYINS AND DROPOUTS WERE NOT WELL ENOUGH DEFINED TO BE USED IN SELECTION PROCEDURES. THE DROPOUT WAS MORE LIEKLY TO BE YOUNGER, UNMARRIED OR WIDOWED, LIVE ALONE OR WITH HIS PARENTS, ENGAGED IN CLERICAL OCCUPATIONS, AND WAS MOST OFTEN FOUND IN LANGUAGE, COMMERCIAL, AND CLERICAL COURSES. THE LARGEST DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RESPONSES OF DROPOUTS AND STAYINS SEEMED TO OCCUR IN MATTERS INVOLVING THE RESPONDENT PERSONALLY--WHETHER HE FELT AT HOME IN THE CLASS, WHETHER HE GOT TO KNOW MANY STUDENTS, AND WHETHER HE FOUND THE COURSE INTERESTING OR USEFUL. THERE WAS A MARKED TENDENCY FOR STAYINS' FRIENDS TO BE STAYINS AND DROPOUTS' FRIENDS TO BE DROPOUTS. IN LARGE MEASURE, DROPOUTS WERE TAKING NIGHT SCHOOL COURSES FOR THE FIRST TIME. (THE DOCUMENT INCLUDES REFERENCES, 34 TABLES, LISTS OF CODING CATEGORIES, AND THE QUESTIONNAIRES.) (AJ)

ED018769

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF NIGHT SCHOOL DROP-OUTS

(A Schedule 10 Project)

Mrs. Mubarka Alam
Dr. E. N. Wright

AC 002 427

RESEARCH SERVICE

issued by the
Research Department

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

A STUDY OF NIGHT SCHOOL DROP-OUTS

(A Schedule 10 Project)

Mrs. Mubarka Alam
Dr. E. N. Wright

Research Department
March, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURE	7
Sample Selection	7
Questionnaire Construction and Related Literature	10
RESULTS	17
A Comparison of The Characteristics of Stay-ins and Drop-outs (Background Information)	17
Age and Sex	18
Marital Status and Members of the Household	20
Language	24
Income and Occupation	24
A Comparison of The Characteristics of Stay-ins and Drop-outs (School-Related Information)	32
Formal Education	32
Previous and Initial Night School Experiences	38
Reasons For Joining Night School	47
Stay-ins' and Drop-outs' Opinions About Night School	49
Reasons For Dropping Out and Continuing Night School	53
Reasons For Continuing	53
Reasons For Dropping Out	53
Significant Others	60
SUMMARY	64
IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	66
REFERENCES	68
APPENDIX	73
Additional Tables	74
List of Coding Categories	77
Questionnaire	92

A STUDY OF NIGHT SCHOOL DROP-OUTS[1]

INTRODUCTION

Adult Education has become the educational frontier of the twentieth century, though its origins can be traced back to ancient times. The great teachers of the past, Aristotle and Plato, were teachers of mature men and women. Not until the nineteenth century, however, did Adult Education begin to take shape as an organized movement, and since then, it has taken widely different directions in different countries.

The changing needs of society have greatly influenced the historical development of Adult Education. The process of Adult Education, even when not known by that name, has been one of the principal instruments for meeting deep social needs such as the need for educating citizen-rulers, the need for increasing industrial skills during the Industrial Revolution and during the war, the need for readjustment during depressions and the need for constructive use of increased leisure time. Traditionally Adult Education has spurted in growth during times of crises. But it has never grown so rapidly or so continuously as it has in the years following World War II. This was caused to an extent by the quickening of technological changes in the economy.

In Canada, one obvious change is the considerable decrease in the size of the agricultural labour force in the last two decades. According to the last census, taken in 1961, only 10% of the population was accounted for in the agricultural labour force: "The loss of farm workers between 1946 and 1958 averaged 39,000 annually." (Porter, 1966, p. 140). "The number of people employed in the primary industries dropped from 1.4 million in 1946 to just

---

[1] Funded jointly by the Province of Ontario and the Federal Government under Schedule 10.

over 828,000 in 1965, with a further decline of another 100,000 expected by 1970" (Bell, 1966, p.4).

This drastic change in the labour force has brought about a change in the occupational structure -- a shift from manual to non-manual occupations. These sharp drops in employment requirements in the primary industries have had a tremendous impact on rural-urban shifts in our population and have created a massive adjustment problem for the manpower resources involved in these shifts (Bell, 1966).

> "Although over all the work force is more highly skilled and now has a greater proportion of white collar than blue collar workers many groups are threatened with downward social mobility because of technological change, because they live in a depressed area, or because of their age. No longer can we speak of a homogeneous class of manual workers. There is rather at the bottom of the economic system a class of those with redundant skills, or a class of uneducated workers who are becoming more and more superfluous to the economy. This bottom class contains the unskilled labour that has come off the farms. Technological change threatens many other manual workers with membership in this class."
>
> ... Porter, 1966, p. 154

An extensive review of the salient features of American adult education programmes was made by Mewhort in 1959. In 1963 a comprehensive review of literature culminated in a critical examination of the nature of Adult Education (LaFountaine, 1963). These two documents provide an extensive background for the study reported here. (See also LaFountaine, 1966.)

With such major occupational changes, the importance of Adult Education has increased. The Federal Government has devoted considerable monies to vocational training and retraining. There is, however, relatively little research available on Adult Education in Canada so that the literature

available from the United States provided much of the background for this study.

Several studies have examined why adults participate in Adult Education activities. Kempfer (1955) felt that the individual usually joined a course when a situation arose in which he could not solve a problem. According to Sharp (1954) there are several other reasons, including a desire for creative expression in all forms of art, or a desire to acquire either formal education or vocational training. Knowles (1950) reported forty incentives for adult learning, including: health; security for old age; leisure; pride of accomplishment; knowledge to be good parents, creative or gregarious. The adult student wants to satisfy his curiosity, appreciate beauty and win others' affection. Sheffield (1964) went further still by categorizing fifty-eight reasons for joining night school under seven different headings. His report includes an excellent discussion on the orientation profiles of continuous learners (i.e., the patterns of reasons people have for continuing to take courses at night school). Factor analysis was used to identify the groupings or orientations among the 453 respondents.

Much more research and many more articles, including early work by Echert, 1928, Hewitt, 1930, O'Boyle, 1930 and Miller, 1930 have been contributed on the specific Adult Education problem of drop-outs. The drop-outs have been a subject of much interest because of their growing numbers "which becomes a considerable social loss and the cost of Adult Education when measured in terms of productivity of objectives, becomes disproportionately high." (Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 157). These drop-outs are of special concern to the adult educators and the government, as enrollment in educational activities is voluntary.

The drop-out problem was recognized as early as 1814 when Thomas Pole urged educators to visit their students' homes in order to bring them back to school (Verner and Davis, 1964). Preston (1958) indicated that only 4% of the students taking part in high school evening classes achieved the purpose for which they came, while Baldwin (1940) reports that 6% do so in a similar situation. Love (1949) reports that 90% of the students following a course of study in an evening college fail to reach their goals. Failure to achieve objectives appears to be the result of numerous related factors that lie in the nature of the student and his objectives, the school, the administration, the teacher and the nature of the educational opportunities available.

It was not until the twentieth century, however, that systematic investigations into the problem were initiated. Since 1928, thirty studies related to attendance and dropping-out have been completed yet the extent and nature of research in this area is still not well known to adult educators. Spence and Evans (1956) noted that there was almost no comprehensive research on drop-outs.

According to Verner and Davis (1964) the thirty studies mentioned previously have "approached the question of attendance by studying either persistence or discontinuance of attendance which are, in effect, two aspects of the same thing." (Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 158). Most of the research just mentioned is descriptive in nature. That is, the persisters have been compared with the drop-outs or certain factors have been compared with the rate of discontinuance, or persistence in certain groups. "The reactional studies on the other hand, usually involve the obtaining of responses from adult drop-outs such as: reasons for discontinuing adult education, criticisms of the programme, and suggestions for its improvement." (Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 158).

It is now forty years since studies first started appearing. A marked change is being noted in the style and quality of research. The "studies are more sophisticated now with respect to the design, the kind of data collected, the analytical interrelationships attempted, and in the use of appropriate statistical processes." (Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 156). The more recent studies have employed tests for statistical significance, factor analysis, and factor loading. These studies, therefore, have greater validity than earlier ones which did not test the data.

Until the year 1963 thirty studies had been done out of which nineteen were conducted in secondary schools. Five investigations were done in adult programmes at the college level. These studies involved both adult schools and colleges; two of them dealt with discussion groups and one involved a sample from a Young Men's Christian Association study group (Verner and Davis, 1964, p. 158).

The control of the sample has been one of the greatest drawbacks in the studies in Adult Education. In some cases, the total sample was not large enough. "Zahn and Phillips (1961) employed extremely small samples of drop-outs, seven in one portion of their study and fifteen in another portion. Savides' (1960) study was based on data from only nine drop-outs, plus eighteen persistent attenders. Generally, populations or samples of enrollers and persistent attenders were noticeably larger than those of drop-outs." (Davis, 1963, p. 14)

Eleven of the above mentioned studies made use of questionnaires to collect their data. Six studies used interview schedules and six other studies used schedules to extract data from institutional records. Three studies made use of various kinds of instruments including an interest test, an anxiety scale, an abilities test, an attitude scale and an activities

check list. Only six studies specifically reported pretesting of the instruments (Verner and Davis, 1964).

The existing studies indicate a need for a study that provides a representative sample of both stay-ins and drop-outs so that it is possible not only to describe drop-outs but also compare them with stay-ins on a variety of factors including both motivational and environmental.

PROCEDURE

Two major problems had to be solved, a representative sample had to be drawn and a method for collecting information devised. It was decided to use a face-to-face interview so that the interviewer could probe for additional information in certain areas, e.g., when asking the reasons for dropping out. It was planned to have equal-sized random samples of drop-outs and stay-ins. The final sample of completed interviews comprised 240 stay-ins and 243 drop-outs.

Sample Selection

A drop-out was defined as a person who missed three consecutive classes at night school. All night school courses were included except those in English and Citizenship which were omitted as it was felt that students in this programme were a unique group.

The Toronto Board of Education arranged to get the monthly list of drop-outs to the end of January, 1967, from all the night schools under its jurisdiction and from the Boards of the Boroughs of Scarborough, North York, East York and York. A total of 21,164 names of drop-outs was received. Using a table of random numbers, 425 names were selected.

A different procedure of random selection was developed for the stay-in sample because complete class lists were not available from all Boards. All classes were numbered and every other class, i.e., each odd numbered class was identified and a random number, not larger than thirty, was used to identify the student in that class to be selected. From 1,000 such numbers 774 names were selected; the rest were dummy numbers, i.e., the class had fewer students than the random number for that class, (e.g. if in a class

of 20 students the 25th student was required, then no student was selected from that class). This procedure removed any selection bias due to class size, because taking a student from each class would have over represented students in small classes. From this list of 774 names, every other name was selected leaving a final usable sample of 382 (a few names had to be excluded for special reasons, e.g., one name was a duplicate, another subject lived 50 miles away).

Survey Research Ltd. was given the names of the 425 drop-outs and 382 stay-ins to contact for interviewing. The first step was a telephone call to request co-operation, arrange an appointment and confirm basic data, i.e., that name, address, and school attended were correct. Since it developed that many of the respondents had registered for more than one course and since the selection procedure identified individuals but not the course in which they were registered, it was decided to use the first course which they mentioned as the basis for the interview. The result of this decision was that a student might have been randomly selected from students in a course in geometry but have been interviewed on the basis of the history course he also attended. In addition, a few respondents claimed to have been misidentified as either drop-outs or stay-ins. Some of these misidentifications were not reported until the interviewer was conducting the interview. Since the interviewer used different questionnaire forms for stay-ins and drop-outs, this meant that "reasons for dropping out" were lost for three respondents who were originally identified as stay-ins. An additional twenty-three "drop-outs" had subsequently returned to classes and had to be treated as "stay-ins."

The results were as follows:

	Stay-ins	Drop-outs
Final working sample	370	426
Not interviewed	128	182
Interview lost in mail or incomplete	2	1
Completed interviews	240	243

The breakdown for the people who were not interviewed is as follows:

	Stay-ins	Drop-outs
Refused	36	44
Hard to get for appointment or no answer to telephone (no interview)	31	34
Moved -- out of town	12	20
Moved -- no forwarding address	17	30
Claim not to have registered	7	4
Did not speak English	3	1
Building torn down	--	2
No such address	6	8
Respondent unknown	16	39
Total	128	182

Questionnaire Construction and Related Literature

The construction of the questionnaire was a critical element in this study since people from a large number of night schools, located in the heart of a large urban area as well as the suburbs, were to be included. In building the questionnaire, an attempt was made to take into account the findings of previous research which focused primarily on the concerns of small groups of people associated with the night school programmes in Toronto as well as areas which had not previously been studied in relation to night school, such as "significant others."

The questionnaire was designed to be easily used by a large number of interviewers. Although it was possible to pre-code the majority of the questions (i.e., provide answer categories a priori), some open-ended questions were included where there was danger that in restricting the answers to a number of prescribed categories valuable information might be lost. Where open-ended questions were used, coding categories were subsequently built on the basis of the obtained responses so that the categories would better reflect the answers that were received. These categories are all reported in the Appendix.

The literature on Adult Education provided guidelines for many of the items that were included in the questionnaire. Findings to date, have indicated that many differences exist between stay-ins and drop-outs, and that these differences often lie in the characteristics of the individual participants (rather than in the programme). Demographic characteristics such as age and sex, socio-economic factors such as occupation and income, and personality factors have been identified as being related to dropping out.

In eleven studies where the factor of age was studied, five studies found no relationship to staying in or dropping out (Echert, 1928; Greenwood, 1932; Novak and Weiant, 1960; Savides, 1960; Ulmer, 1960). On the other

hand, Dirks (1955), Davis (1961), Ewigleben (1959), Preston (1958) and Reynolds (1957) report that young adults drop out more frequently than older adults. Verner and Newberry (1958) however, found that the influence of age was most appreciable for individuals on the extremes of the age continuum.

Similar disagreement has also been reported with respect to the relationship between sex and night school attendance. Some researchers report no relationship between these variables (Davis, 1961; Echert, 1928 and Greenwood, 1932) while others have found a higher drop-out rate for women than for men (Ewigleben, 1959; Great Books Foundation, 1954; Ulmer, 1963).

Dirks (1955) and Echert (1928) found that previous educational attainment was unrelated to dropping out. Again, in a contrary fashion, other researchers (Ewigleben, 1959; Great Books Foundation, 1954; Greenburger, 1936; Novak and Weiant, 1960 and Reynolds, 1957) have found that people with more education tend to be more persistent, i.e., are less likely to drop out. Preston (1958) at least partly accounted for this confusion when he found that people at the extremes of the educational continuum are more likely to persist; in other words, the stay-ins are most likely to be people with some graduate education or with less than Grade 8 education. Greenwood (1932) found that people who dropped out of school in their youth because of dislike for school persisted longer.

Some researchers studied the relationship between prior failure in school and persistence in Adult Education courses. Four studies (Dirks, 1955; Greenwood, 1932; Preston, 1958 and Savides, 1960) report that no relationship exists; whereas Ewigleben (1959) reports that people who have been out of school longer are more likely to drop out than those who have recently left school.

The relationship of marital status to persistence in night school attendance has also been studied, and again there are no consistent findings. Two studies found a statistically significant relationship and indicated that married students drop out less frequently than single students (Davis, 1961 and Ulmer, 1963). Greenwood (1932) on the other hand, found that unmarried males dropped out less frequently than married males. Savides (1960) reported that adult students with negative home situations were more likely to drop out. Dirks (1955) indicated that drop-outs had more dependents than persistent attenders. Preston (1958) found that drop-outs had more very small children than did stay-ins.

No relationship was reported between occupation and drop-out rate (Echert, 1928; Greenwood, 1932; Novak and Weiant, 1960 and Savides, 1960), although Savides (1960) did find that people having long periods of service with one employer tended to persist longer than people with short terms.

Income was another of the factors associated with socio-economic status which was investigated; Preston (1958) and Ewigleben (1959) found that drop-outs tended to come from lower economic groups i.e., earning less than $3,000.

Some psycho-social characteristics have also been studied including factors such as intelligence and reasons for going to night school. Greenburger (1936) found no relationship between intelligence and drop-out rates, while Zahn and Phillips (1961) found that students having lower ability to achieve academically tended to drop out of university extension classes at a significantly higher rate than those with more ability.

Five studies examined the relationship between the reasons for going to night school and the drop-out rate. Carey (1953) and Echert (1928) reported no relationship, while Dirks (1955) and Preston (1958) reported that those adults who enrolled to complete high school courses or to improve hobby

skills tended to have low drop-out rates. Greenburger (1936) felt that students enrolling in a job-related subject, or to advance themselves occupationally were less likely to drop out than students enrolling for other reasons. This observation by Greenburger is contradicted by the findings of Dirks (1955) and Preston (1958) which show that students enrolling at night school in order to advance themselves occupationally had higher drop-out rates than other students. Preston (1958) also found that if students enrolled in order to return to work from an inactive status, the drop-out rate was greater than that of other students.

Participation in organized activities has been found to have a relationship to the drop-out rate. Students active in community affairs tend to persist longer and have a lower drop-out rate than inactive students (Brunner, 1957 and Verner and Newberry, 1958). Although night school appears to be different from a social organization it seems that people active in community affairs have a set of attitudes or a personality that is compatible with night school success. Verner and Newberry (1958) feel that active members are more apt to have a better perception of the purposes of the organization than inactive members. They also believe that active members feel a greater sense of responsibility to the association than inactive members. It is evident that in studying participation, one is studying the relationship of the individual to the group (Beal, 1950 and Rose, 1952).

A successful relationship to a group, including perceiving the group's goals and feeling a responsibility to the group probably involves abilities that stand a student in good stead. He must relate to the teacher, perceive the goals of the course and accept responsibility for these goals, i.e., make them his goals.

Many other factors that were found to have a relationship with staying in or dropping out can be referred to as situational factors; some

of these can be identified as school-related situations, others as non-school related. Two school-related factors which have been studied are the amount of training the teacher has received and her rating as a teacher in the school system. There is no evidence of a relationship between the preparation of the teacher and subsequent student drop-outs (Davis, 1961). Not surprisingly, however, student satisfaction with the teacher is related to attendance, drop-outs tending to be less satisfied with their teachers than those who persist (Davis, 1961; Dirks, 1955; Novak and Weiant, 1960).

When Davis (1963) measured the participant's attitudes about the class at the end of the first session of a civil defence class, he found no statistically significant relationship between attitude scale scores and the percentage of drop-outs.

Davis (1963) also attempted to study teachers' performance, based on teacher activities which could be perceived by the students during the first class meeting. All but one statement showed no relationship to dropping out. The drop-out rate was significantly lower than average in classes where the students thought that the teacher spoke to them as equals.

The administration of the school has been studied in relation to dropping out. In this report a broad concept of administration is used which includes all aspects of night school which potentially might be under administrative control. As an example, Adult Education classes are usually held in the evening, although now there is a tendency to have classes scheduled at other times; the time of meeting and the length of the class are among the elements considered under administration.

The length of the course in relation to persistence has been studied; in one case a relationship was established (Pattyson, 1961) while in two

studies no relationship between length of course and tendency to drop-out could be established (Echert, 1928 and Preston, 1958).

The influence of length of class has also been studied but no significant differences were found between persistence and whether class meetings were of one or two hour durations (Davis, 1963).

Frequency of meetings has also been found to affect attendance in some situations. In a junior college evening credit programme, persistence of attendance was significantly better in classes which met once a week as opposed to any other frequency of meeting (Verner, 1963). Davis (1963) however, did not find any difference between classes meeting once a month and those meeting twice each week.

Adult Education programmes charging tuition had a substantially greater holding power than those without tuition, although a smaller percentage enrolled when tuition was levied (Wright, 1952).

Pre-registration counselling tends to increase the stay-in rate. Students who received counselling persisted longer than those who did not (Baldwin, 1940; Ewigleben, 1959; Greenburger, 1936; Greenwood, 1932; Preston, 1958).

The course (subject) taken and drop-out rate has been studied in five projects; however, each study found a different rank order of courses in relation to the proportion of drop-outs (Baldwin, 1940; Ewigleben, 1959; Pattyson, 1961; Waller, 1933; Wright, 1952).

"Significant others" are people who are important to the individual; they include those to whom the individual pays attention because of admiration and those to whom the individual has to pay attention because of relationship, such as his boss or a parent. Adult educators have referred to the importance of significant others but it does not seem to have been studied in relation to Adult Education.

Dr. Kidd (1961) in his recommendations to the Toronto Board of Education said in relation to the students coming to night school, "But the largest number came as the result of a suggestion by 'friends and relatives'." (p. 11).

According to Mewhort (1959) "Adult learning appears neither to germinate nor to flourish in solitary confinement." (p. 6).

Murray (1965) has reviewed the theoretical bases for the concept of significant others and provides references for many of the studies done outside the field of Adult Education.

The question still remains, "To whom do night school students talk about night school?" While it is obvious, without research, that such people must in some cases influence a decision to attend or to drop out, it is not obvious whether the role of significant others for stay-ins is different in degree from the role of significant others for drop-outs.

RESULTS

The sampling procedure was designed to obtain information about night school students in Metropolitan Toronto. The design does not make it possible to compare municipalities nor is it wise to do so since the addresses of the respondents showed that many people do not attend classes in the municipality where they reside. The face-to-face interview provided a great deal of information nearly all of which is reported, in some form, in this section. A sample questionnaire may be found in the Appendix. As some of the open-ended questions required the construction of coding categories these are listed in detail, also in the Appendix.

To facilitate reading, the results have been somewhat arbitrarily grouped under general headings, beginning with a comparison of the characteristics of stay-ins and drop-outs. The reasons for joining night school follow and from there the report moves to student opinions, attitudes, reasons for dropping out and the importance of significant others.

A Comparison of The Characteristics of Stay-ins and Drop-outs (Background Information)

In a previous report (Adult Education in Metropolitan Toronto, Cohen et al, 1967) significant differences were found with respect to many background characteristics (e.g. education, age, occupation, and income) between those who attended and those who did not attend night school. It may come as a surprise to the reader that only a few of these characteristics distinguish between drop-outs and stay-ins. Those that do differentiate between drop-outs and stay-ins seem to be a dependent cluster of variables, e.g., marital status, whether there are children in the household, and whether the respondent lives alone, with parents, spouse or friends. Age also is significantly related to dropping out or staying in.

Age and Sex

There was no significant relationship between dropping out and whether the student was male or female (see Table I). There was, however, a significant relationship between age and dropping out (see Table II); thus 18% of all drop-outs fell in the 15 - 19 year old category and only 7% of the stay-ins were in this category. Of the stay-ins, 28.4% were between the ages of 30 and 39, while only 20% of the drop-outs fell in this age bracket. The majority of both drop-outs and stay-ins were under 40. The largest number of people fell in the 20 - 24 year old category (23% of the stay-ins and nearly 30% of the drop-outs).

TABLE I

SEX OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Sex	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Male	46.2	43.2	44.7
Female	53.7	56.7	55.2
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-square = .465

Not Significant

TABLE II

AGE OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Age Categories	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
15 - 19	7.1	18.1	12.6
20 - 24	23.3	29.6	26.5
25 - 29	17.1	15.2	16.1
30 - 34	12.1	10.3	11.2
35 - 39	16.2	9.8	13.0
40 - 44	7.9	5.3	6.6
45 - 49	5.8	4.1	5.0
50 - 59	7.1	4.9	6.0
60 and above	3.3	2.4	2.8
Total	99.9	99.7	99.8

Chi-square = 20.02 Level of Significance <.02

Marital Status and Members of the Household

Several questions dealt with the respondent's household. The results must be considered together because when one discovers that drop-outs are less likely to be married than are stay-ins (see Table III), then it is perfectly reasonable to discover that drop-outs are more likely to live alone than are stay-ins (see Table IV).

While married students were more likely to be stay-ins, marriage was obviously not a major factor as 42.9% of the stay-ins were single and 56.4% of the drop-outs were single. Although widowed students were relatively rare, they were three times more likely to be drop-outs than stay-ins, as only .8% of the stay-ins fell in this category but 2.9% of the drop-outs were widowed.

Table IV indicates that drop-outs and stay-ins, as would be expected from Table III, live in different kinds of households. Although the numbers are small the most interesting difference is found in the category, "student lived with spouse and parents." Only .8% of the stay-ins lived in this kind of household but 4.1% of the drop-outs (and a smaller percentage of this group were married) lived in these circumstances.

Table V shows that the size of the household is not significantly related to dropping out. Approximately one-fifth (21.1%) of the students come from households of two people, one-fifth (18.8%) come from households of three people and one-fifth (20.3%) come from households of four people. Thus it appears to be the kind of household, i.e., the relationship of the other members of the household to the respondent, rather than the size which may make a difference.

TABLE III

MARITAL STATUS OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Marital Status	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Single	42.9	56.4	49.6
Married	54.2	37.8	46.0
Widowed	.8	2.9	1.9
Other	2.1	2.9	2.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = 14.487 Level of Significance <.001

TABLE IV

PEOPLE WITH WHOM THE STUDENTS SHARED ACCOMMODATION
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Students Shared Accommodation With	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
No one (student lived alone)	7.9	11.6	9.2
Parents	25.3	32.6	29.0
Spouse and Family	53.9	33.9	43.9
Spouse and Parents	.8	4.1	2.5
Other Relatives	5.0	4.5	4.7
Friends	7.1	12.8	9.9
No Response	---	.4	.2
Total	100.0	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square (with "No Response" excluded) = 24.365

Level of Significance <.001

TABLE V

NUMBER OF PERSONS LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD
FOR STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Number of Persons Living in Household (Including Respondent)	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
1	6.6	9.1	7.9
2	21.6	20.7	21.1
3	21.6	16.1	18.8
4	22.4	18.2	20.3
5	12.0	17.7	14.9
6	6.2	8.3	7.2
7	4.1	2.9	3.5
8	2.5	2.5	3.5
9 or more	2.9	3.7	3.3
No Response	---	.8	.4
Total	99.9	100.0	99.9

Chi-Square (with "No Response" excluded) = 8.0246

Not Significant

This is further born out by Table VI which shows that there is a relationship between not having children and dropping out. The comparison ignored single people, i.e., those falling in the category, "No Response," to compensate for the disproportionate number of married stay-ins. Of all stay-ins, 41.5% had children compared to 29.7% of the drop-outs. The actual number of children is not related to staying in or dropping out (see Table VII). This table only compares those who had children so the percentages are based on a smaller total number.

The number of siblings which the respondent has is also unrelated to whether or not he is a drop-out. As Table VIII indicates, the stay-ins and drop-outs are about equally likely to have a large number or a small number of brothers and sisters. Nearly a quarter (22.6%) had one sibling and one-fifth (20.3%) had two siblings. Over one-tenth (11.4%) came from large families, i.e., had seven or more brothers and sisters.

Language

The fact that English is the student's second language seems to be unrelated to whether he stays in or drops out (see Table IX). Of the stay-ins, 28.6% spoke English as a second language contrasted with 31.8% of the drop-outs.

Income and Occupation

Income was found to be unrelated to dropping out (see Table X). The respondent's answer to the question about income was given to the interviewer in a sealed envelope. This resulted in a very low number of refusals (8.5%). The most surprising information was that 26.3% of the students had incomes of $10,000 or more and 18.4% had incomes less than $5,000.

Thirteen occupational categories were provided for coding "occupation," although four categories were not used by the respondents, i.e., farming, retired, unemployed and student. There was a significant relationship between occupation

and dropping out but an examination of Table XI demonstrates that the relationship is neither dramatic nor of great predictive value. For example, women who were "housekeepers" comprised 18.3% of the stay-ins and 8.7% of the drop-outs and refusals to answer comprise 1.2% of the stay-ins and 4.9% of the drop-outs. Clerical workers were less likely to be found among the stay-ins (30.4% versus 38.8%) and skilled workers were more likely to be found among the stay-ins (23.7% versus 17.7%).

TABLE VI

CHILDREN LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD*
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Children Living in Household	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Yes	41.5	29.7	24.4
No	31.5	17.3	35.6
No Response	26.9	52.9	39.9
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square (based only on "Yes" and "No" responses) = 34.917

Level of Significance <.001

* This question was intended for those respondents who were not single. In at least one or two cases the respondent replied in terms of younger brothers and sisters or children from other households in a multiple dwelling.

TABLE VII

FAMILY SIZE FOR STUDENTS WITH CHILDREN
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Number of Children	Stay-ins (N = 100)	Drop-outs (N = 71)	Total (N = 171)
1	41.0	32.4	37.4
2	33.0	29.5	31.6
3	20.0	23.9	21.6
4	5.0	11.3	7.6
5	1.0	2.8	1.7
Total	100.0	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square = 5.201 Not Significant

TABLE VIII

TOTAL NUMBER OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Number of Siblings	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
None	7.0	8.7	7.8
1	23.2	21.9	22.6
2	19.9	20.7	20.3
3	15.4	15.7	15.5
4	10.0	9.9	9.9
5	6.2	7.8	7.0
6	6.2	4.1	5.2
7 or More	12.0	10.7	11.4
No Response	---	.4	.2
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square (with "No Response" excluded) = 1.658

Not Significant

TABLE IX

WHETHER OR NOT ENGLISH IS STUDENT'S NATIVE LANGUAGE
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Is English Native Language?	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Yes	71.4	68.2	69.8
No	28.6	31.8	30.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = .582

Not Significant

TABLE X

INCOME OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Income in Dollars	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Below 1,000	.4	.4	.4
1,000 to 1,999	2.1	.4	1.2
2,000 to 2,999	2.5	1.2	1.9
3,000 to 3,999	5.0	6.2	5.6
4,000 to 4,999	8.7	9.9	9.3
5,000 to 5,999	13.3	14.8	14.1
6,000 to 6,999	11.7	10.7	11.2
7,000 to 7,999	10.8	9.1	9.9
8,000 to 9,999	11.7	11.5	11.6
10,000 and above	26.7	25.9	26.3
No Response	7.1	9.9	8.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = 6.030

Not Significant

TABLE XI

OCCUPATION OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Occupation	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Professional	12.5	12.4	12.4
Owner, Manager	2.9	1.7	2.3
Sales	4.5	6.2	5.4
Clerical	30.4	38.8	34.6
Skilled	23.7	17.7	20.7
Unskilled	5.4	8.3	6.8
Housekeeping	18.3	8.7	13.5
Military	1.2	1.2	1.2
No Response	1.2	4.9	3.1
Total	100.1	99.9	100.0

Chi-Square = 21.054 Level of Significance $< .01$

A Comparison Of The Characteristics Of Stay-ins and Drop-outs (School-Related Information)

Although "number of years of schooling," "number of grades failed" and similar information is traditionally thought of as "Background Information" it was decided to present these results in a separate section as this report is concerned with "school." As well as dealing with previous education this section also includes some information about previous night school experience and information about the number of courses for which respondents registered in the year under study (1966-1967).

Formal Education

Table XII shows clearly that there is no difference between the previous education of stay-ins and drop-outs. Almost half the students (44.2%) report part of secondary school was completed and 16.5% had attended part or all of a university or a college programme. An additional 27.1% of the population had completed secondary school.

There was no significant difference between the ages at which stay-ins and drop-outs left school (see Table XIII). Three-quarters (74.8%) terminated school when they were 15 to 19 years old; one-tenth (10.7%) left formal education when they were less than 15 years old.

The marks which they received, (see Table XIV) and whether or not they had failed a grade (see Table XV) also failed to show any significant difference between stay-ins and drop-outs.

Indeed, even the reasons they gave for not going further in school showed no significant differences between these groups (see Table XVI). Nearly one-third (30.9%) said in essence that there was nothing more for them in school at that time. This included both those who stopped because they had reached their objective, e.g., a graduation certificate, and those who could not reach their objective, i.e., they quit because they had failed.

TABLE XII

PREVIOUS EDUCATION OF STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Level of Education*	Stay-ins (N = 239)	Drop-outs (N = 240)	Total (N = 479)
Public or Grade School	12.5	11.7	12.1
Part of High or Technical School	43.5	45.0	44.2
Finished High or Technical School	28.4	25.8	27.1
Part of University or College	6.7	6.6	6.7
Graduated from University or College	6.3	7.1	6.7
Graduate or Professional Studies After Graduation	2.5	3.7	3.1
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square = 2.128 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XIII

AGE AT WHICH STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS STOPPED FORMAL EDUCATION EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Age*	Stay-ins (N = 236)	Drop-outs (N = 237)	Total (N = 473)
10 and Below	---	.8	.4
11 - 14	11.9	8.9	10.3
15 - 19	73.7	75.9	74.8
20 - 24	12.2	13.1	12.7
25 - 29	1.7	1.2	1.5
30 and Above	.4	---	.2
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square = 4.3043 — Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XIV

GRADES RECEIVED IN SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Grades Received*	Stay-ins (N = 239)	Drop-outs (N = 240)	Total (N = 479)
Excellent	9.6	15.4	12.5
Good	37.2	34.6	35.9
Average	51.4	46.2	48.8
Below Average	1.7	3.7	2.7
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square = 6.340 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XV

FAILURES IN SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

School Success*	Stay-ins (N = 236)	Drop-outs (N = 240)	Total (N = 476)
Failed a Grade in School	30.5	32.1	31.3
Did not Fail a Grade in School	69.5	67.9	68.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = .294 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XVI

REASONS FOR DISCONTINUING FORMAL EDUCATION
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons*	Stay-ins (N = 235)	Drop-outs (N = 234)	Total (N = 469)
Job Related Skill	19.6	17.9	18.7
Still Attending School	2.1	1.7	1.9
Dislike for School	8.5	9.0	8.7
Lack of Schools	1.2	2.1	1.7
Objective Met - or Because They Failed	31.1	30.8	30.9
Financial Problems	13.6	14.1	13.8
Marriage	10.2	8.5	9.4
Personal and Family	13.6	15.8	14.7
Total	99.9	99.9	99.8

Chi-Square = 2.692 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

The one table showing significant results in this section is the distribution of answers to the question, "What was the most important thing that happened to you in school?" (see Table XVII). The major differences are found in the "No Response" category, 41.2% of the stay-ins compared to 33.3% of the drop-outs either would not or could not answer this question.

Previous and Initial Night School Experiences

While experiences in formal education bore little relationship to night school experience, previous and initial night school experience showed some significant differences between the two groups.

As seen in Table XVIII, stay-ins, for the most part, (70.2%), had attended night school before but for more than half (52.3%) of the drop-outs, this was their first night school course. Of those who had attended night school before, 80.8% of the stay-ins and 79.5% of the drop-outs reported that they had completed these courses. There were not enough previous drop-outs to warrant further analysis of this data.

About one-fifth of both stay-ins (21.1%) and drop-outs (23.6%) said they began studying before classes started (see Table XIX). Nearly two-thirds of the stay-ins (63.9%) and drop-outs (64.5%) would have liked some preparation before the course began (see Table XX).

Not surprisingly, in light of Table XVIII, Table XXI shows that the stay-ins are more likely to say that they will take more courses (87.9%) than the drop-outs (77.2%).

TABLE XVII

MOST IMPORTANT THING THAT HAPPENED IN SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Most Important Thing	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Teachers	6.2	6.6	6.4
Sports	4.6	6.2	5.3
Academic Achievement	17.1	19.7	18.4
Enjoyment of (Subject)	10.8	16.4	13.6
Personal Interest	20.0	17.7	18.8
No Response	41.2	33.3	37.3
Total	99.9	99.9	99.8

Chi-Square = 21.515 Level of Significance <.01

TABLE XVIII

PREVIOUS ATTENDANCE AT NIGHT SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Previous Attendance*	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Yes	70.2	47.7	48.9
No	29.8	52.3	41.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = 18.2890 Level of Significance <.001

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XIX

STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS WHO BEGAN STUDYING BEFORE REGISTRATION EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Response*	Stay-ins (N = 218)	Drop-outs (N = 237)	Total (N = 455)
Yes	21.1	23.6	22.4
No	78.9	76.4	77.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = .4170 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XX

STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS WHO WERE
IN FAVOUR OF SOME PREPARATION BEFORE NIGHT SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Response*	Stay-ins (N = 227)	Drop-outs (N = 234)	Total (N = 461)
Yes	63.9	64.5	64.2
No	36.1	35.5	35.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = .0211 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XXI

STUDENTS WHO PLAN TO TAKE MORE COURSES
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Response*	Stay-ins (N = 214)	Drop-outs (N = 237)	Total (N = 451)
Yes	87.9	77.2	82.3
No	12.1	22.8	17.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = 8.716 Level of Significance $< .01$

* "No Response" excluded

The great variety of courses taken at night school had to be classified and grouped together, for analysis and reporting. The following headings not only show the classifications used but suggest the range of subjects available at night school.

1. Language

This heading included all language courses except literature courses, such as French literature, and language courses taken for academic credit.

2. Commercial and Clerical

This section included courses taken essentially for office work, such as typing, shorthand, business machines, key-punching and bookkeeping.

3. Skills Related to Home

This category included courses in sewing, dressmaking, dress designing, various crafts, cooking, hostess cooking, cake decorating, flower arrangement, interior decorating, millinery, weaving and home nursing. These courses remained in this category as long as there was no evidence that they were being taken for the purposes of employment.

4. Academic

All courses taken for credit were included in this category, e.g., history, geography, (English) grammar, chemistry, physics, trigonometry and mathematics.

5. Business and Professional Courses

The courses included in this category were those related to business and industry, having some degree of sophistication, and involving a marketable "office" skill, e.g., real estate, advertising, R. A. accounting, computer programming, merchandising, steel design, job management, commercial art, dental technician and nursing.

6. Personal Skills

This category included courses which were taken by the person to improve himself, e.g., speed reading, physical education, swimming, public speaking, driver education.

7. Fine Arts

This category was limited to acquisition of personal skills and talents, although they could be used for commercial purposes, e.g., sculpture, pottery, ceramics, painting, drawing, ornamental iron work, fashion drawing, creative writing, photography, opera, drama, music.

8. Technical and Trade Skills (including needle trades)

The courses included here were technical in nature; they could be listed as a trade and/or could be used in factory or shop. The courses included were: electricity, electronics, air conditioning and electrical appliances, oil and gas business, wood working, printing, welding, dry cleaning, radio, lithography, drafting, blueprint reading, upholstery, plumbing, automotive mechanics, cabinet making, trowel trades, automotive transmission, electrical construction, aviation, aircraft, machine shop, television service, sheet metal layout, tailoring.

While any categorization can be debated, it was essential to try and identify only a few major areas for the purposes of analysis. This categorization was successful in as much as it does reveal that the type of subject taken and the drop-out rate are related. Table XXII should be carefully examined for the actual percentages for each subject type. The subject areas "skills related to the home" and "technical and trade skills" were more likely to have stay-ins than drop-outs while the converse was true for "language" and "commercial and clerical" courses.

TABLE XXII

COURSES TAKEN AT NIGHT SCHOOL
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Type of Courses Taken	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
Language	14.1	21.5	17.8
Commercial and Clerical	12.4	22.3	17.4
Skills Related to Home	16.2	11.2	13.7
Academic	17.8	15.7	16.7
Business and Professional Courses	3.3	2.1	2.7
Personal Skills	6.2	4.1	5.1
Fine Arts	7.1	6.2	6.6
Technical and Trade Skills	22.8	16.9	19.8
Total	99.9	100.0	99.8

Chi-Square = 16.971 Level of Significance $<.01$

Reasons For Joining Night School

The question asking about reasons for joining night school employed a probe, i.e., after the respondent gave his reason he was asked "were there any other reasons?". The categories used to code these responses were developed on the basis of the responses which were obtained and are reported in detail in the Appendix. The results show that for most people there was only one reason for attending night school; less than half the respondents gave a second reason, and less than 10% gave a third reason (see Appendix, Table XXXII). The replies of the stay-ins and drop-outs did not differ significantly so they will be discussed in terms of the responses of all 483 respondents. The first response is given in Table XXIII (the second and third responses are found in the Appendix, Table XXXII). The most common reason for attending night school (30.2%) was to learn a skill. This category included those people who wanted a specific skill for use around the home, as well as those who wished to use the skill to pursue a hobby. Slightly over one-fifth (22.0%) joined night school in order to obtain a degree or certificate, while slightly less than one-fifth (19.5%) joined night school for job advancement. One of these three reasons was given as a first response by 74.9% of the drop-outs and 68.3% of the stay-ins. It appears that most people have concrete reasons for joining night school. These three reasons still account for about half of the responses in the second reply (see the Appendix, Table XXXII).

TABLE XXIII

REASONS FOR JOINING NIGHT SCHOOL
(1st REASON GIVEN) EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Total (N = 483)
No Response	.4	.0	.2
Learning as a Goal	15.8	13.2	14.5
Learning For a General Purpose	8.6	4.1	6.4
Learning a Skill	32.0	28.4	30.2
Learning for Certificate Degree	19.6	24.3	22.0
Personal Advantage (Job)	16.7	22.2	19.5
Personal Reasons	5.0	6.6	5.8
Social Reasons	1.6	1.2	1.5
Total	99.7	100.0	100.1

Chi-Square = 9.98 Not Significant

Stay-ins' and Drop-outs' Opinions About Night School

Question Number 19 asked the respondent for his opinion on a wide range of matters from the suitability of the classroom temperature to whether the method of presentation was interesting. (Questions 17, 18, 21, and 22 are also included in this section.)

These questions represented a heterogeneous catalogue of possible complaints or problems gleaned from the literature as well as from the preliminary discussion with night school personnel prior to building the questionnaires. A quick examination of the replies (summarized in Table XXIV) shows that a large proportion of both stay-ins and drop-outs had a positive attitude towards night school. The reader is asked to remember, however, that the sample represents thousands of students and a small per cent of negative replies in essence represent several hundred students who were not satisfied.

For the most part, a significantly larger proportion of stay-ins than drop-outs responded positively to the questions. Some of the outstanding differences will be noted below, though the reader is advised to carefully examine Table XXIV for a more comprehensive picture.

Questions for which the drop-outs responded much less positively than the stay-ins often seemed to deal with personal matters. Of the stay-ins, 83.7% said they got along very well with the teacher and 82.1% said they got along well with the students. For the drop-outs the figures were 64.6% and 55.9% respectively. In response to the question as to whether they personally felt at home in the class, 94.6% of the stay-ins said "yes" but only 77.0% of the drop-outs said "yes." In a similar vein 67.5% of the stay-ins got to know many of the students in the class compared to 40.3% of the drop-outs. This last question is biased somewhat because the stay-ins obviously had more opportunities to get to know their classmates.

TABLE XXIV

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER AND THE CLASSROOM

Statements	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Value of Z Using Test of Proportions
Teacher Treated Us As Adults in Class	95.0	89.3	2.33*
Had No Trouble Understanding The Language of The Teacher	84.6	83.1	.43
Teacher Connected Course With Interesting Things Outside Class	73.3	54.3	3.99**
Teacher Explained What Course Would Include	84.2	81.5	.78
Method of Presentation Used By Teacher Made Course Interesting	88.8	71.2	4.81**
Teacher Knew The Subject He Was Teaching	98.3	90.9	3.60**
Teacher Modified The Course According to Needs and Interests of the Class	66.3	53.1	2.95**
Readily Understood Subject Matter of the Course	92.1	81.1	3.55**
Feeling in the Classroom Was Friendly	96.3	88.1	3.34**
Personally Felt At Home in the Classroom	94.5	76.9	5.54**
Got to Know Many Students in Class	67.5	40.3	5.99**

* Value of Z Significant at the .05 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

** Value of Z Significant at the .01 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

(Table continued on next page.)

TABLE XXXV (Continued)

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER AND THE CLASSROOM

Statements	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Value of Z Using Test of Proportions
Got Along Very Well With the Teacher	83.7	64.6	4.80**
Got Along Fairly Well With the Teacher	14.6	28.8	-3.79**
Got Along Very Well With the Students	82.1	55.9	6.20**
Got Along Fairly Well With the Students	17.9	37.0	-4.70**
Did Not Feel Left Out	93.7	83.5	3.53**
Found the Course About Right	80.8	61.7	4.63**
Found the Course Too Simple	14.1	17.7	-1.05
Found the Course Too Advanced	4.6	15.2	-3.55**
Found Furniture in Rooms Satisfactory	89.9	86.4	1.21
Found Lighting in the Rooms Satisfactory	97.5	93.8	1.97*
Found Temperature in the Rooms Satisfactory	82.1	89.7	-2.17*
Found Ventilation in the Rooms Satisfactory	86.2	86.8	- .19
Teaching Aids Were Satisfactory	81.6	69.5	3.09**
Found Subject Matter of the Course Interesting	94.5	79.0	5.05**

* Value of Z Significant at the .05 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

** Value of Z Significant at the .01 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

(Table continued on next page.)

TABLE XXIV (Continued)

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS HAVING A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS VARIOUS CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER AND THE CLASSROOM

Statements	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Value of Z Using Test of Proportions
Found Course Useful	93.7	76.7	5.21**
Adequate References Available	81.5	74.9	2.52*
Night School Met Expectations	77.1	58.4	4.38**
Teacher Measured Up to Expectations	85.8	72.0	3.72**

* Value of Z Significant at the .05 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

** Value of Z Significant at the .01 Level (Two-Tailed Test)

Reasons For Dropping Out and Continuing Night School

It seemed likely that some of the stay-ins had at some time considered dropping out, but had finally decided to continue. An analysis of their reasons for continuing is a useful adjunct to the reasons for dropping out. An attempt was also made to determine what reasons the students gave for the dropping out of other students. The answers to these questions obviously includes an indirect measure of the respondent's perception of the classroom.

Reasons for Continuing

When the stay-ins were asked, "Did you ever feel fed up with night school?" 73.5% of the stay-ins said "yes." However, when they were asked the question, "Did you ever think of quitting?" 10.9% said "yes." Of the 24 who said that they had thought of quitting 8 said that they continued for reasons which could be categorized as "in order to gain personal advancement in relation to their work" and 6 gave reasons which related to the fact that they were learning a skill which they wanted. (The remainder gave various reasons which cannot be summarized under a general heading.)

Reasons for Dropping Out

In order to explore the full range of reasons as well as to obtain reasons which the respondent might not give immediately, the interviewer probed twice, "Were there any other reasons -- even small ones -- involved in your giving up the course in (name of course)?". All but 1.6% of the drop-outs responded when asked for the reason they dropped out. When probed, 53.1% provided no second reason. So few provided a third reason that the third response was not categorized and therefore is not included in the analysis. The reasons given for dropping out are listed in Table XXV. In light of the much lower response rate to the first probe it seems reasonable to assume that for the most part the first answer was the most relevant one.

There were few complaints about the teacher given as reasons for dropping out (2.5%) (see Table XXV). The few complaints which did appear were in the younger (under 30) age groups (see Table XXVI). This age group accounted for all the "No Responses" (1st time) and were, with the exception of one respondent in his 50's, the only ones who said that they quit because they had accomplished their goal.

"Administration" was a very broad category; it included all reasons which were directed at the school but which the teacher could not control. Although everything related to the class size, classrooms, lengthy classes, punctuality of students and poor guidance in course selection was included, only 7.8% gave dissatisfaction with these matters as reasons for dropping out. The course itself was given as a reason by 16.5% of the students, while general dissatisfaction was a reason for 12.3%. School-related reasons, i.e., teacher inadequacy, course inadequacy, etc., were given by 39.1% as reasons for dropping out.

The students at night school are pressed for time and have tight schedules; nearly 90% of the sample is 20 years of age or older, 37.9% are married and have the responsibilities of a family, so it is evident that the students have a number of commitments in addition to their studies. A considerable number (19.7%) said that they had to drop out of school because of personal and family reasons; an additional 22.2% seemed unable to continue because of their jobs. Of these, 6.2% reported that the combination of night school and their job was too much of a load. Some students (13.2%) specifically stated time-related reasons for dropping out.

It is interesting to note that the reasons for dropping out tend to be related to age. A close examination of Table XXVI suggests some of these patterns although the number of cases is too small in some of the age groups to draw conclusions with any confidence.

TABLE XXV

REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons for Dropping Out	1st Reason (N = 243)	2nd Reason (N = 243)	Total (N = 486)
Teacher's Inadequacy in Relation to Students and Content	2.5	3.7	3.0
Course Inadequacy	16.5	8.6	12.5
General Dissatisfaction	12.3	10.3	11.3
Administration	7.8	3.7	5.8
Personal Reasons	19.7	6.6	13.2
Time-Related Reasons	13.2	9.5	11.3
Need Accomplished	4.1	1.2	2.7
Job Interfered	22.2	3.3	12.7
No Response	1.6	53.1	27.4
Total	99.9	100.0	99.9

TABLE XXVI

AGE AS RELATED TO REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT (N = 243)

ge	Teacher's Inadequacy in Relation to Students and Content	Course Inadequacy	General Dissatisfaction	Administration	Personal Reasons	Time-Related Reasons	Need Accomplished	Job Interfered	No Response
- 19	1.2	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.4	1.6	.8	4.5	.8
- 24	.4	4.5	4.9	1.2	6.2	3.7	2.1	5.7	.8
- 29	.8	2.9	.8	.4	3.3	3.3	.8	2.9	---
- 34	---	.8	1.2	2.1	2.9	.8	---	2.5	---
- 39	---	1.6	.8	1.2	1.2	1.6	---	3.3	---
- 44	---	2.4	.4	.0	.8	.0	---	1.6	---
- 49	---	1.2	.0	.4	.8	.8	---	.8	---
- 59	---	.0	1.6	---	.8	1.2	.4	.8	---
and bove	---	.8	.4	---	1.2	.0	---	---	---
l expressed as rcentage of 243	2.5	16.5	12.3	7.8	19.7	13.2	4.1	22.2	1.6

Table XXVII indicates that both stay-ins and drop-outs had a similar perception of the reasons that other people had for dropping out. A dramatic difference appears when the drop-outs' own reasons are compared with the reasons that they think others had for dropping out (see Table XXVIII). While they were almost twice as likely to attribute the dropping out by others to school-related reasons as they were to give school-related reasons themselves (73.1% versus 39.7%). Conversely the drop-out was more than twice as likely to give a reason that related to himself when giving a reason for himself than when talking about others (60.3% versus 26.8%). There is obviously clear disagreement between self-perception and perception of others in the matter of reasons for dropping out of night school.

The classes in English and Citizenship were not included in the study. There were many English speaking students in other classes for whom English was not their first language. Their reasons for dropping out are found in the Appendix, Table XXXIII. There seem to be no noteworthy differences between the reasons they give and the reasons native English speakers give for dropping out.

Respondents were asked whether other people in their class dropped out, and if so, why they thought these other people dropped out. Of the stay-ins 131 gave reasons and of the drop-outs 108 gave reasons. The small number of responses in some cases made it necessary to collapse the cells before making any statistical comparisons (the raw data is reported in Table XXXIV in the Appendix).

TABLE XXVII

REASONS GIVEN BY STAY-INS AND DROP-OUTS
AS THE REASONS THAT OTHERS IN THEIR CLASS QUIT
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons*	Stay-ins (N = 131)	Drop-outs (N = 108)	Total (N - 239)
Teacher	3.8	12.0	7.5
Course	32.1	29.6	31.0
General Dissatisfaction and Administration	29.8	31.5	30.5
Personal	11.4	11.1	11.3
Other Reasons	22.9	15.7	19.7
Total	100.0	99.9	100.0

Chi-Square = 7.030 Not Significant

* Complete numerical breakdown for each reason given in Appendix, Table XXXIV

TABLE XXVIII

REASONS GIVEN BY DROP-OUTS FOR THEIR OWN DROPPING OUT AND THE DROPPING OUT OF OTHERS EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons*	Why I Quit (N = 239)	Why Others Quit (N = 108)
Teacher	2.5	12.0
Course	16.7	29.6
General Dissatisfaction	12.6	24.1
Administration	7.9	7.4
Personal	24.3	11.1
Time	13.4	11.1
Job	22.6	4.6
Total	100.0	99.9

Chi-Square = 44.144 Level of Significance <.001

* Complete numerical breakdown for each reason given in Appendix, Table XXXIV

Significant Others

For the most part questions which attempted to identify the role of "significant others" showed no differences between stay-ins and drop-outs. Even the questions dealing with participation in organizations, buried in the questions about time utilization, showed no significant difference. Of all the questions dealing with time utilization only the item dealing with studying showed a significant difference; 21.9% of the stay-ins and 34.4% of the drop-outs spent "no time" studying.

Before going to night school, 60% (60.9% of the stay-ins and 60.0% of the drop-outs) of the students discussed it with someone. Who this person was is not related to whether the respondent was a drop-out or stay-in. Although these differences are not significant, there are some interesting patterns. When asked for a second person with whom they discussed night school 24% of the stay-ins and 33% of the drop-outs identified someone: a third person was identified by 7% of the stay-ins and 11% of the drop-outs. The drop-outs are more ready to report people with whom they discussed night school than are the stay-ins. Since the question was not designed to identify the number of people, this data must remain as an interesting suggestion not a fact.

Returning to the first person with whom the respondent reported discussing night school we find, not surprisingly, that it was most likely to be a member of the immediate family (34.3% of the stay-ins and 29.3% of the drop-outs); business friends were consulted (5.8% of the stay-ins and 8.7% of the drop-outs) as were people identified as principals or teachers (2.1% of the stay-ins and 4.5% of the drop-outs). The rest of the people

were identified as friends. Almost all of these people (over 94% when all categories were totalled) were reported to have a favourable reaction towards the respondent going to night school.

An important difference emerged, however, when the respondent was asked, "What kinds of problems do you discuss with him/her/them?". Table XXI shows a different pattern of answers from stay-ins and drop-outs. The source of this significant difference lies in the fact that stay-ins were much more likely to reply, "All Problems" (59.6%) than were drop-outs (34.3%). The drop-outs were, in other words, more likely to identify specific problem areas than were the stay-ins.

Another approach to significant others was also taken by asking the respondent whom they <u>often</u> talked with and then asking whether they talked about night school with these people and whether or not these people had a favourable attitude. There were no significant differences between the stay-ins and drop-outs. The responses were similar to the previous questions. Landlords or landladies were mentioned by 34.4% of the stay-ins and 30.0% of the drop-outs; night school friends were mentioned by 5.4% of the stay-ins and 2.4% of the drop-outs. The stay-ins and drop-outs, in total, reported that 82% of the people with whom they often talked knew they were going to night school and of those who knew, 84.0% had a favourable attitude toward night school.

The response to one question did suggest that friends played an important role for drop-outs. As Table XXX shows, slightly over one-third of both stay-ins (38.5%) and drop-outs (40.3%) reported that they had friends attending night school. Table XXXI shows that the stay-ins' friends were far less likely to be drop-outs than were the drop-outs' friends. The differences were dramatic; only 24.1% of the stay-ins' friends were drop-outs but 69.1% of the drop-outs' friends also dropped out.

TABLE XXIX

KINDS OF PROBLEMS DISCUSSED BY RESPONDENT WITH THE INDIVIDUAL WHOM HE CONSULTED ABOUT NIGHT SCHOOL EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Kinds of Problems Discussed	Stay-ins (N = 114)	Drop-outs (N = 105)	Total (N = 219)
Personal and Family	27.2	40.0	33.3
Business	8.8	15.2	11.8
All Problems	59.6	34.3	47.5
Other	4.3	10.4	7.3
Total	99.9	99.9	99.9

Chi-Square = 14.793 Level of Significance <.01

TABLE XXX

ATTENDANCE AT NIGHT SCHOOL BY FRIENDS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Response*	Stay-ins (N = 218)	Drop-outs (N = 236)	Total (N = 454)
Yes	38.5	40.3	39.4
No	61.5	59.7	60.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = .141 Not Significant

* "No Response" excluded

TABLE XXXI

COMPLETION OF COURSES BY FRIENDS
EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Response*	Stay-ins (N = 83)	Drop-outs (N = 94)	Total (N = 177)
Yes	75.9	30.9	52.0
No	24.1	69.1	48.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-Square = 35.843 Level of Significance >.001

* "No Response" excluded

SUMMARY

The stay-in is not a very different person from the drop-out. Both stay-ins and drop-outs include a wide range of educational, occupational, and economic backgrounds. There are a few differences which are well enough defined to be reliable; however, they are not well enough defined to use for any kind of selection procedure. The younger (below the age of 25), unmarried student is somewhat more likely to be a drop-out than the older, married student. Widowed students also seem likely to become drop-outs. Consistent with the above, the drop-out is likely to live alone or with his parents. Size of the household, whether the student is male or female, and whether or not the student speaks English as his first language appear to be irrelevant. Married stay-ins are less likely to have children than are married drop-outs, but for those with children, the number is unrelated to dropping out.

Income is not related to dropping out, but occupation is. This last fact is not particularly useful because the major difference was seen in the category, "housekeeping"; married women were far more likely to be stay-ins than drop-outs (this is consistent with the finding of "married," "childless," stay-ins). Students engaged in clerical occupations were found more frequently among the drop-outs than among the stay-ins.

The various experiences in <u>formal</u> education were not related to dropping out of night school. Stay-ins were far more likely than drop-outs to have attended night school before (70% and 48% respectively) and were more likely than drop-outs to go to night school again (88% and 77% respectively). Stay-ins were more likely to be found in technical, trade and skills courses, while drop-outs were more likely to be found in language, commercial and clerical courses.

Although the stay-ins had a more positive view of night school than did the drop-outs, both groups tended to be very favourable in their opinions. The largest differences between the responses of stay-ins and drop-outs seemed to occur in matters which involved the respondent personally, whether he felt at home in the class, whether he got to know many students and whether he found the course interesting or useful.

This emphasis on the "personal" was clearly revealed in the reasons for dropping out. Drop-outs were less likely to report school-related reasons to explain why they dropped out, although they used school-related reasons to explain the dropping out of other students in their class.

"Significant others" did not seem to play an important role in differentiating between stay-ins and drop-outs except for friends who also attended night school. There was a marked tendency for stay-ins' friends to be stay-ins and drop-outs' friends to be drop-outs.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Drop-outs are not greatly different from stay-ins. In large measure drop-outs are people who are taking night school courses for the first time. Without question, attending night school requires planning, effort and time. Many people have several commitments in terms of work, duties at home, and even to themselves. To try to accommodate the additional demands of night school requires commitments that many people cannot or will not make. Those who have succeeded in making the adjustments once are better prepared to make them a second time.

In a quick reading of the results, the "personal" (in its broadest meaning) aspects of life sharply separate the drop-outs from the stay-ins.

It is clear that neither the drop-outs nor the stay-ins are aware of the strong influence of factors unrelated to school. However, it is not safe to infer that the school can do nothing just because present students accept the present limitations. The student who must stop for a while often cannot start again until the next Fall when he must start at the beginning again. The right time for and the right length of class varies for the students but there is no present procedure for introducing much flexibility.

Thus there are many aspects of the individual's life which interfere with night school and result in his dropping out. At present he has no other alternatives which will let him modify his programme in light of his own perceived situation.

In spite of this emphasis on the drop-out, let it not be thought that the school was free from faults; teachers, courses of study and administration were criticized. The point is that though it is possible, and in some cases necessary, to change staff and content there will be drop-outs as long as other aspects of the individual's life are not considered in building highly flexible programmes. If the full-time student needs flexible programmes, flexibility is needed much more by adults who, in addition to night school, have a full life to lead and many responsibilities.

REFERENCES [1]

Baldwin, C. B. Why adult evening school students leave. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of California, 1940.**

Baum, O. E., et al. Psychotherapy, drop outs and lower socioeconomic patients. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36 (4), pp. 629-634.

Beal, G. M. Additional hypotheses in participation research. Rural Sociology, 1956, 21, pp. 249-256.*

Bell, R. Planning and purpose in adult education in Ontario. Paper presented at the Founding Conference of the Ontario Association for Continuing Education, Toronto, 1966.

Booth, A. A demographic consideration of non-participation. Adult Education, 1961, 11 (4), pp. 223-229.

Brickman, W. C. The school drop-out and adult education. School and Society, 1964, 92, p. 179.

Brunner, E. de S., et al. An overview of adult education research. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1959.**

Burroughs, G.E.R. The application of factor analysis to problems of learning. British Journal of Psychology, 1966, 36 (2), pp. 227-228.

Carey, J. T. Why students drop out. Chicago: Center for the Study of the Liberal Education of Adults, 1953.

Carson, R. P. Factors related to the participation of selected young adult males in continuing education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State School of Education, 1965.

Cohen, A. et al. Adult education in metropolitan Toronto: a situation report. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Department, May, 1967.

Davis, G. S., Jr. A study of classroom factors related to drop-outs in adult education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State School of Education, 1963.

Davis, G. S., Jr. & Wright, R. Characteristics of civil defense adult education teachers: a study of selected teacher characteristics and their relationship to adult teaching. Florida Adult Educator, 1963, 13.**

---

1 Verner and Newberry (1958) completed an intensive review of research on Adult Education. References marked with an asterisk (*) were drawn from this source. This review was extended by Verner and Davis in 1964 and references drawn from this source are marked with a double asterisk (**).

Davis, J. A. Great books and small groups. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.**

Deane, S. R. Who seeks adult education and why? Adult Education, 1950, 1 (1), pp. 18-24.

Dirks, H. B. Drop outs in the evening adult school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1955.**

Dominion Bureau of Statistics - Education Division. Participants in further education in Canada. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, October, 1963.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics - Education Division. Survey of adult education 1963-64. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, July, 1966.

Dresher, R. H. Factors in voluntary drop-outs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 32, pp. 287-289.

E.C.L. Reports. Adult education. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Education Centre Library, August, 1963.

Ewigleben, R. L. The identification and analysis of the factors contributing to the drop-out rate among participants in classes of the Lansing adult school program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.**

Great Books Foundation. Great books under discussion. Chicago: The Foundation, 1954.**

Greenburger, L. F. Adult education through evening high schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1936.**

Greenwood, W. B. A study of persistence of public evening high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1932.**

Hallenbeck, W. C., et al. Theory and method. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1962.

Hely, A. S. M. New trends in adult education from Elsinore to Montreal. Paris: U.N.E.S.C.O., 1962.

Johnson, G. B., Jr. A proposed technique for the analysis of drop-outs at a state college. Journal of Educational Research, 1954, 47, pp. 381-387.

Johnstone, J. W. C. Adult uses of education - fact and forecast. In H. W. Burns (Ed.), Sociological backgrounds of adult education. Chicago: Center for the Study of the Liberal Education of Adults, 1964.

Johnstone, J. W. C. Is there a future for adult education in the U.S.? M.L.A. Quarterly, 1965, 26, pp. 34-41.

Johnstone, J. W. C., & Riveria, Ramon J. Volunteers for learning. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Jones, H. A. The centre idea - student participation. Adult Education, 1966, 39 (4), pp. 198-208.

Kapas, A. Toronto speaks. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

Kempfer, H. Identifying educational needs of adults. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

Kempfer. H. Adult education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Kidd, J. R. 18 to 80 - continuing education in Metropolitan Toronto. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, 1960.

Kidd, J. R. Recommendations: continuing education in the Toronto Board of Education. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, October, 1961.

Kidd, J. R. Continuing education. A pre-conference paper prepared for the Second Canadian Conference on Education, Ottawa, 1962.

Knoff, R. P., & Verner, C. An attitude scale technique for evaluating meetings. Adult Education, 1957, 7 (4), pp. 212-215.

Knowles, M. Informal adult education. New York: Association Press, 1950.

Kuhlen, R. G. (Ed.) Psychology and adult education. Psychological Backgrounds of Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of the Liberal Education of Adults, 1963.

LaFountaine, M. E. Adult education - a gross illusion. Continuous Learning, 1966, 5 (1), pp. 5-12.

Love, R. A. A call for action. School and Society, 1949, 70, pp. 227-231.

Love. R. A. The use of motivation research to determine interest in adult college-level training. Educational Record, 1953, 34 (5), pp. 210-218.

Mann, W. E. Adult drop-outs. Continuous Learning, 1966, 5 (2 & 3), pp. 55-65 & 127-143.

McFarland, T. F. & Sonquist, D. E. Interests as a basis for a program of adult education. Religious Education, 1930, 25.**

Mewhort, D. S. 1959 study tour of adult education in selected American cities: report to the Toronto Board of Education. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, 1960.

Miller, H. S. Reasons for elimination from the public evening high school. Unpublished Master's thesis, Temple University, 1930.**

Miller, L. H. & McGuire, Christine H. Evaluating liberal adult education. Chicago: Center for the Study of the Liberal Education of Adults, 1961.

Mizruchi, E. & Vaneria, L. M. Who participates in adult education? Adult Education, 1960, 10, pp. 141-143.

Murray, J. S. Influence of self concepts, significant others and interactive patterns on the publication activity of agricultural scientists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

N.E.A. A study of urban public school adult education programs of the United States. Washington: National Education Association, 1952.**

Nicholson, D. H. Why adults attend schools. Adult Education Bulletin, 1949, 13, pp. 172-177.

Novak, B. J. & Weiant, Gwendolyn E. Why do evening school students drop-out? Adult Education, 1960, 11, pp. 35-41.

O'Boyle, J. A. A study of elimination in three evening elementary schools of Philadelphia. Unpublished Master's thesis, Temple University, 1930.**

Pattyson, J. W. The influence of certain factors on attendence in public school adult education programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State School of Education, 1961.

Porter, J. A. The vertical mosaic: an analysis of social class and power in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Porter, P. B. Fluctuation of public evening high school attendance in Los Angeles. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1928.**

Preston, J. M. The study of continuing and non-continuing adult students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1958.**

Quarantelli, E. L., & Cooper, J. D. Self-Conceptions and others: a further Meadian hypothesis. The Sociological Quarterly, 1966, 7 (3), pp. 281-297.

Reynolds, L. C. Adult dropouts. Adult and Veteran's Education Bulletin. Tampa: Hillsborough County Board of Public Instruction, Summer, 1967.**

Rose, A. M. Union solidarity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.*

Savides, H. A. An identification of some characteristics of students who complete and students who drop out of an evening technical curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1960.**

Senter, J. Adult education. Toronto: Globe and Mail, 1960. (Selected articles reprinted from the Toronto Globe and Mail.)

Spence, R. B. and Evans, Louise H. Drop outs in adult education. Adult Education, 1956, 6, (4) pp. 221-225.

Stott, Margaret M., & Verner, C. A trial bibliography of research pertaining to adult education. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Extension Department, 1965.

Syracuse University. New directions for adult education. Proceedings of the Conference of Administrative Officers and Deans of Syracuse University, 1958.

Tessener, R. A., and Tessener, Louise M. Review of literature on school drop outs. National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin, 1958, 42.**

Thomson, M., & Ironside, Diana J. A bibliography of Canadian writings in adult education. Toronto: Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1956.

Toronto Daily Star Supplement. It's catching - urge-to-learn fever. Toronto: Toronto Daily Star, September 17, 1966.

Ulmer, R. C. A study of drop-outs in the evening division of a community college. Unpublished Master's thesis, Florida State School of Education, 1960.**

Verner, C. Factors affecting attendance in a junior college adult program. Adult Education, 1965, 13 (3), pp. 153-158.

Verner, C., & Davis, G. S., Jr. Completions and drop outs: a review of research. Adult Education, 1964, 14 (3), pp. 157-176

Verner, C., & Newberry, J. S. The nature of adult participation. Adult Education, 1958, 8 (4), pp. 208-222.

Verner, C., & Neylan, Margaret S. Patterns of attendance in adult night school courses. Canadian Education and Research Digest, 1966, 6 (3), pp. 230-240.

Waller, Eva May. A study of factors influencing attendance in the adult homemaking programs in Phoenix, Arizona. Unpublished Master's thesis, Colorado Agricultural College, 1933.**

Wright, Grace S. Persistence of attendance in adult education classes. Circular 353. Washington: Federal Security Agency, 1952.**

APPENDIX

TABLE XXXII

REASONS FOR JOINING NIGHT SCHOOL
(2nd AND 3rd REASONS) EXPRESSED AS A PERCENTAGE

Reasons	2nd Reason		3rd Reason	
	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)	Stay-ins (N = 240)	Drop-outs (N = 243)
No Response	52.1	60.5	92.9	90.5
Learning as a Goal	11.7	7.0	1.2	1.6
Learning For a General Purpose	1.6	3.3	1.2	.4
Learning a Skill	9.2	6.2	.8	1.6
Learning for Certificate Degree	5.0	5.3	.0	.8
Personal Advantage (Job)	8.7	11.9	.4	2.5
Personal Reasons	8.7	4.1	2.1	2.1
Social Reasons	2.9	1.6	1.2	.4
Total	99.9	99.9	99.8	99.9

TABLE XXXIII

REASONS FOR DROPPING OUT AS CLASSIFIED BY ENGLISH AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS

-out	Teacher Inadequacy in Relation to Student	Teacher Inadequacy Relating to Content	Course Inadequacy	General Dissatisfaction	Administration	Personal Reasons	Time Related Reasons	Need Accomplished	Job Interference	No Response
sh e age 166)	1.2	.6	15.7	13.3	9.0	21.7	13.9	3.0	21.1	.6
sh Not e age 77)	---	3.9	18.2	10.4	5.2	15.5	11.6	6.5	24.7	3.9
243)	.8	1.6	16.4	12.3	7.8	19.7	13.1	4.1	22.2	1.6

TABLE XXXIV

REASONS GIVEN FOR DROPPING OUT OF NIGHT SCHOOL

Reasons	Reasons Drop-outs Gave for Quitting	Stay-in's Reasons for Why Others Quit	Drop-out's Reasons for Why Others Quit
Teacher Relating to Students	2	2	8
Teacher Relating To Content	4	3	5
Course	40	42	32
General Dissatisfaction	30	38	26
Administration	19	1	8
Personal	48	35	12
Time	32	9	12
Need Accomplished	10	2	--
Job	54	19	5
Total Number of Responses	239	131	108
No Response	4	109	131
Total Number of Respondents	243	240	243

LIST OF CODING CATEGORIES

	Page
Face Sheet Coding	78
Kind of Course on Which Interview Based	79
Occupational Categories (6)*	80
Relationship of People With Whom Night School Was Discussed (14b (i), 34b and 36d)	81
Kinds of Problems Discussed With "This" Person (14b (i) and (iv))	82
People or Groups With Whom Respondent Frequently Talks (14c)	83
Reasons For Going to Night School or For Continuing Night School (15 and 36b)	84
Reasons For Leaving Night School or For Dissatisfaction With Night School (17b, 18b, 23, 24c, 32b, 42c, 44b)	86
-- Primary Categories	86
-- Sub-Categories	87
Reasons For Stopping Formal Education (50)	90
Single Most Significant School Event (51)	91

---

* The numbers in parentheses refer to the question numbers on the Respondent Record Sheet.

FACE SHEET CODING

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

SAMPLE TYPE

1 -- stayin

2 -- dropout

3 -- stayin interviewed in dropout form

4 -- dropout interviewed in stayin form

SEX

1 -- male

2 -- female

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

1 -- same address

2 -- changed address

KIND OF COURSE ON WHICH INTERVIEW BASED (SEE FOLLOWING PAGE FOR CODING CATEGORIES)

NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN

1 -- one course taken

2 -- two courses taken

3 -- three courses taken

4 -- four or more courses taken

NUMBER OF COMPLETED COURSES

0 -- no course completed

1 -- information not available

2 -- completed one course

3 -- completed two courses

4 -- completed three courses

5 -- completed four courses

KIND OF COURSE ON WHICH INTERVIEW BASED

1 LANGUAGE

2 COMMERCIAL AND CLERICAL

typing and shorthand; business machines; keypunching; bookkeeping; library

3 SKILLS RELATED TO HOME

dressmaking; crafts; cooking; flower arrangement; interior decorating; millinery; hostess cookery; weaving; cake decorating; home nursing; sewing; dress designing

4 ACADEMIC

history; geography; (English) grammar; chemistry; physics; trigonometry; mathematics; minerology; lapidary

5 BUSINESSMEN'S COURSES AND PROFESSIONAL COURSES

real estate; advertising; R. A. accounting; computer programming; merchandising; steel design; instructor's workshop; job management; commercial art; dental technician; nursing

6 PERSONAL SKILLS

speed reading; physical education; swimming; gymnasium; public speaking; driver education

7 FINE ARTS

opera; sculpture; pottery; ceramics; music; painting; drawing; ornamental ironwork; fashion drawing; creative writing; photography; drama

8 TECHNICAL SKILLS AND TRADE SKILLS (INCLUDING NEEDLE TRADES)

electricity; electronics; air conditioning and electrical appliances; oil and gas burners; wood-working; printing; welding; dry cleaning; radio; lithography; drafting; blueprint reading; upholstery; plumbing; automotive mechanics; cabinet-making; trowel trade; automotive transmissions; electrical construction; aviation; aircraft; machine shop; T. V. service; sheet metal layout; tailoring

OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES
(Question 6)

01 Professional

02 Owners -- managers

03 Sales

04 Clerical -- office, etc.

05 Skilled

06 Unskilled

07 Farmer, ranch, market gardener

08 Housekeeper, widow

09 Retired (men)

11 Unemployed

12 Army

13 Student

14 Did not state

RELATIONSHIP OF PEOPLE WITH WHOM NIGHT SCHOOL WAS DISCUSSED
(Questions14b(i), 34b and 36d)

01 No Response

02 Other

03 Don't Know

10 IMMEDIATE FAMILY

11 Parents/Mother/Father

12 Wife/Husband

13 Brother/Sister

14 Daughter/Son

15 Family -- General

20 RELATIONS

21 Uncle/Aunt

22 Grandfather/Grandmother

23 Cousins

24 In-Laws

25 Relatives -- General

30 BUSINESS ASSOCIATES

31 Superiors

32 Co-workers

33 Customers

41 LANDLORD/LANDLADY

51 FRIENDS/NEIGHBOURS

61 FRIENDS WHO WENT TO NIGHT SCHOOL

70 EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS

71 Principals/Vice-Principals

72 Teachers

73 Guidance Workers

KINDS OF PROBLEMS DISCUSSED WITH "THIS" PERSON
(Question 14b (i) and (iv))

1 No Response

2 Other

3 Don't Know

4 Personal Problems; Family/Domestic Problems

5 Studies

6 Hobbies

7 My Future

8 All Problems

9 Work Matters (Including Changing Jobs)

PEOPLE OR GROUPS WITH WHOM RESPONDENT FREQUENTLY TALKS (Question 14c)

01 No Response
02 Other
03 Don't Know
10 IMMEDIATE FAMILY
11 Parents/Mother/Father
12 Wife/Husband
13 Brother/Sister
14 Daughter/Son
15 Family -- General
20 RELATIONS
21 Uncle/Aunt
22 Grandfather/Grandmother
23 Cousins
24 In-Laws
25 Relatives -- General
30 BUSINESS ASSOCIATES
31 Superiors
32 Co-workers
33 Customers
41 LANDLORD/LANDLADY
42 FRIENDS/NEIGHBOURS
43 FRIENDS FROM SCHOOL
44 CHURCH GROUP/PEOPLE
50 PROFESSIONALS
51 Teachers/Professionals
52 Medical
53 Others
61 SOCIAL GROUPS

REASONS FOR GOING TO NIGHT SCHOOL OR FOR CONTINUING NIGHT SCHOOL
(Questions 15, 36b)

01 No Response

02 Other

03 Don't Know

04 Not Explainable

10 LEARNING AS A GOAL

11 Need for Knowledge

12 Enjoyment or Satisfaction in Learning or Study

13 Improve or Stimulate Learning -- Keep Mind Active

14 To Pick Up Subjects I Didn't Have

15 Because I'm Interested in, e.g., History

20 LEARNING FOR A GENERAL PURPOSE

21 To Understand People Better, to Understand the World, More Intelligent Consumer, For Effective Citizenship

22 To Get Along Better, Improve Self

23 To Succeed in Life

30 LEARNING A SKILL

31 To Learn to Sew, Cook, Mend, a Handicraft, etc.

32 Language Learning -- Because of Travel, etc.

33 To Improve or Learn a Specific Skill, e.g., Speed Reading, Lacked Shop Experience

34 Physical -- Keep Fit, Lose Weight

35 Help For Hobby

40 LEARNING (CERTIFICATE AS A GOAL)

41 To Get a Degree, Diploma or Certificate

42 To Prepare for College or Other Type of Higher Education

43 To Minimize Period of Education

44 Rather Than Day School

45 I Needed Education

46 To Further Education

50 PERSONAL ADVANCEMENT

51 Do a Better Job, Keep Up-to-Date, More Secure in Job

52 Professional Advancement

53 Get a Better Job, Compete Better, Retraining -- Get a Job

54 Earn More Money, Make a Living

55 Gain Recognition -- Personal (e.g., Among Friends and Associates)

60 PERSONAL REASONS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO SCHOOL PROGRAMME

61 Self
-- Boredom, Restless, Change, To Keep Busy, To Have a Night Out

62 Home
-- To Get Out of House, Get Away From Family Cares

63 Special Referents, e.g., To Exercise My Fingers

64 Financial, Free, Inexpensive

65 Distance (e.g., It Was Close)

66* Perseverance

67* Did Not Quit

68* Failed

70 SOCIABILITY

71 To Make Friends, Meet New People, Enjoy the Association of Others

72 Because of Others, e.g., Friend, Mother, Neighbour, etc. Going

80* CHANGED CLASSES

90* INVESTMENT OF MONEY

---

* Additional categories for 36b

REASONS FOR LEAVING NIGHT SCHOOL OR FOR DISSATISFACTION WITH NIGHT SCHOOL
(Questions 17b, 18b, 23, 24c, 32b, 42c, 44b)

Primary Categories

0 No Response

1 Teacher Inadequacy Relating to Students

2 Teacher Inadequacy Relating to Objects -- Content

3 Course Inadequacy

4 General Dissatisfaction (Bad Investment -- Night School Not Like Day School)

5 Administration (Not Teacher)

6 Personal -- Family

Personal -- Others

7 Time Related

8 Need Accomplished

9 Job Interfered

REASONS FOR LEAVING NIGHT SCHOOL OR FOR DISSATISFACTION WITH NIGHT SCHOOL
(Questions 17b, 18b, 23, 24c, 32b, 42c, 44b)

Sub-Categories

01 No Response

02 Other

03 Don't Know (Attended Too Short a Time)

04 Not Explainable

10 TEACHER INADEQUATE IN RELATION TO STUDENTS

11 Helped Only Good Students, Day Students

12 Teacher Lacked Interest, Didn't Care About Pupils

13 Didn't Meet Student's Needs, Too Much Personal Attention, No Individual Attention (Even if For Lack of Time)

14 Favouritism, Rudeness, Sarcasm to Pupils, Insulting, Critical, Unethical

20 TEACHER INADEQUATE IN METHOD OF PRESENTATION

21 Bad Teaching (General) Poor Planning

22 Poor Presentation and Method, Inexperienced, Poor Handwriting, Made Them Copy

23 Reliance on Textbooks

24 Inadequate Knowledge

25 Not Teacher's Fault -- Accent (English), Teacher Died, Too Old, Too Young

26 No Class Participation -- No Individual Participation

27 Noisy Class (Teacher Liked It) Class Not Under Control -- Can't Handle Class

30 CONTENT INADEQUACY

31 Not Enough Practical Work, e.g., Speaking French

32 Too Much Work Covered (Could Not Catch Up), Too Difficult (Not for Beginners) Not Thorough, Too Fast

33 Course Was Different From What Was Expected

34 Too Elementary

35 Fellow Students Too Slow, Different Ages, Didn't Talk With Him, Not Serious Students

36 Specific Complaint re Detail

37 Too Little Time Spent on Things That Mattered

38 Course Not Available

40 BAD INVESTMENT OF TIME

41 Boring

42 Lack of Interest

43 Not Valuable, Waste of Time

44 It Was a Bother

45 Got Nothing Out of the Course

46 Night School Like Day School -- Not Like Day School

47 Didn't Lead to a Job

48 Not Successful -- Failed

50 ADMINISTRATION

51 Class Too Large

52 Students Late

53 Poor Guidance -- Wrong Class

54 Counselled Out

55 Not Enough Equipment -- Equipment Outdated

56 Two Groups in One Classroom

57 No Breaks Allowed (Two One Hour Periods Would be Better)

58 Changed Schedule

59 Class Cancelled

60 PERSONAL AND FAMILY

61 Marriage

62 Trip

63 Illness

64 Home Duties -- husband wanted her at home, sickness at home, family health, daughter's marriage, family death, husband's classes changed day, household duties, babysitter

65 Moved

66 Met a Girl -- Boy

67 Did Not Want to Continue Because of Others

68 Couldn't Afford to Continue, e.g., Lost Pay at Work

70 TIME RELATED PROBLEMS

71 Distance Was Too Far

72 Time of Class, e.g., Started Too Soon After Work, Got Home Too Late, Travelling at Night, Too Much Time Between Work and Class

73 Too Much Homework -- Not Enough Time for Study

74 Fatigue

75 Busy With Other Enjoyments

76 Took Too Long to Complete the Course

77 Transportation Bad

78 Parking Problems

79 Weather

80 NEED ACCOMPLISHED

81 Got Necessary Requirement for Admission to University of Toronto

82 Help for Day School

83 Wanted to Write Exam and Not the Course

84 Taking a Course to Get Help in Another Course

85 Took Another Course

90 JOB OR DAY-TIME SCHOOL INTERFERED

91 Business Committment

92 Had to go Abroad (Because of Job)

93 School Time Clashed With Work

94 Worked Overtime

95 School and Work Too Much

REASONS FOR STOPPING FORMAL EDUCATION
(Question 50)

01 No Response

02 Other Reasons

03 Don't Know

10 JOB-RELATED

11 To Go To Work

12 Could Learn More in Industry/Business

13 Entered Armed Forces

14 Could Not Go Further Without English

21 STILL ATTENDING SCHOOL

30 ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL

31 Did Not Like School -- Fed Up With School

32 School Was Dull/Boring/Uninteresting

33 Felt I Would Learn More at Business/Night School

40 LACK OF SCHOOLS

41 Went as Far as Schools in Area Could Take Me

51 COMPLETED COURSE/MET OBJECTIVE

52 FAILED ONCE OR MORE OFTEN

60 FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

61 Could Not Afford to Go Any Longer

62 Wanted to Earn Money

71 MARRIAGE/DESIRE TO GET MARRIED

72 FORCED BY CONDITIONS IN OTHER COUNTRY

73 TO COME TO CANADA

80 PERSONAL/FAMILY REASONS

81 Parental Pressure to go to Work

82 Illness in Family

83 Other

SINGLE MOST SIGNIFICANT SCHOOL EVENT
(Question 51)

01 No Response

02 Other Reasons

03 Don't Know

10 TEACHERS

11 One Outstanding Teacher

20 SPORTS

21 Outstanding Achievement

22 Participation

30 ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

31 Satisfaction of Reaching Objective

32 Awards: Scholarship, First-Class Honours

40 ENJOYMENT OF:

41 Reading

42 Music

43 Specific Courses

44 Social Aspects

50 OTHERS

51 Some Personal Incident

52 Quitting/Completing School

SURVEY RESEARCH LIMITED
1129 Leslie Street
Don Mills, Ontario

RESPONDENT RECORD SHEET

Sample List: A ( ) B ( )

Eligible Respondent No. _____

FROM SAMPLE LISTING

RESPONDENT NAME _____	INTERVIEWER ASSIGNED _____
ADDRESS _____	INT. PHONE NO. _____
PHONE NO. _____	

INITIAL DATA

Course Registered:			QUIT	COMPLETED	INTERVIEW TO BE BASED ON
1. _____	School	_____	( )	( )	( )
2. _____	School	_____	( )	( )	( )
3. _____	School	_____	( )	( )	( )
4. _____	School	_____	( )	( )	( )

RECORD OF CONTACT

	DAY	DATE	TIME	RESULT	PHONER
1.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	a.m. p.m.	_____	_____

TIME OF APPOINTMENT

	DAY	DATE	TIME
1.	_____	_____	_____a.m./p.m.
2.	_____	_____	_____a.m./p.m.
3.	_____	_____	_____a.m./p.m.

COURSE INTERVIEW TO BE BASED ON:

(NOTE SPACE ON BACK OF PAGE)

SURVEY RESEARCH LIMITED
1129 Leslie Street
Don Mills, Ontario

QUESTIONNAIRE

ON-SITE INTERVIEW

NAME _____

INTERVIEWER _____ CHECKED _____ RESPONDENT NO. _____

DATE OF INTERVIEW _____ VERIFIED _____ DATE _____

BE SURE YOU HAVE CORRECT RESPONDENT: CHECK FULL NAME

"Thank you very much for co-operating with us in this study. Your help is very much appreciated."

1. "I wonder if I can begin by asking a few questions about yourself."

(a) Into which of the following age groups do you fall?

15-19	☐ 1	30-34	☐ 4	45-49	☐ 7	60 or over	☐ 0
20-24	☐ 2	35-39	☐ 5	50-54	☐ 8		
25-29	☐ 3	40-44	☐ 6	55-59	☐ 9	Refused	☐ X

(b) (i) What is your marital status?

Single ☐ 1 → Go to (2)

Married ☐ 2
Widowed ☐ 3 } → Go to (b) (ii)
Other ☐ 4

(ii) Do you have any children living with you in your household?

Yes ☐ 1 → Go to (b) (iii) No ☐ 2 → Go to (2)

(iii) How many children do you have living with you?

Circle Which: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

2. How many persons, including babies, live in your household, including yourself?

Circle Which: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10+

3. Do you live: (READ LIST COMPLETELY)

CHECK ONLY ONE

Alone	☐ 1	With wife/husband & parents	☐ 4
With parents	☐ 2	With other relatives	☐ 5
With wife/husband and children	☐ 3	With friends	☐ 6

4. (a) How many brothers and sisters did you have in total?

Circle Which: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

(b) How many brothers did you have? Circle Which: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

(c) How many sisters did you have? Circle Which: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7+

5. (a) How many rooms are there in your home, not counting bathrooms?

Circle Which: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10+

(b) Is English your native language? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

6. And what type of work do you do? _____

If employed outside home:

What type of organization are you employed by? _____

7. (a) Are you a member of any type of association, that is, any community organization, social or sports club, lodge, labour union, business association - just any type of association?

Yes ☐ 1 → Go to 7(b)
No ☐ 2 → Go to 8

(b) (i) What is the association in which you are most active?

Write in _____

(ii) And is there another one in which you are second most active? No ☐

Write in _____

(iii) Are you also active in another association? No ☐

Write in _____

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

	CODE (i)	(ii)	(iii)
Academic or professional	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1
Religious/Church	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2
Political	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3
Lodge	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4
Labour Union	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5
Business	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6
Recreation, sports, entertainment	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7
Social, welfare, health	☐ 8	☐ 8	☐ 8
Other: 1._____	☐ 9	☐ 9	☐ 9
2._____	☐ 0	☐ 0	☐ 0

8. Aside from your normal day's work, how much of your time do you spend in each of the following activities:

HAND CARD SET "A" TO RESPONDENT

Rotate in numerical order CIRCLE STARTING POINT	Most of My Time	Considerable Amount of My Time	Some of My Time	Very Little of My Time	None of My Time
	(CHECK ONLY ONE IN EACH HORIZONTAL ROW)				
1. In work around the house	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
2. Work at home related to daytime job (Omit for housewives)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
3. With community service and volunteer organizations	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
4. Hobbies	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
5. With friends and acquaintances	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
6. In relaxation (incl. TV, reading, entertainment)	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5
7. Studying	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	☐ 4	☐ 5

9. If you had a completely free choice, in which activity would you spend most of your time?

READ LIST ALOUD	CHECK ONE ONLY
Workaround house	☐ 1
Work at home related to job	☐ 2
Community service etc.	☐ 3
Hobbies	☐ 4
With friends, acquaintances	☐ 5
Relaxation	☐ 6
Studying	☐ 7
Other	_____

If respondent was registered in more than one course:

From this point on, I would like you to think strictly in terms of the course in _____ (write in) last fall.

(INTERVIEWER: From this point on, you must be sure that, on all questions pertaining to night school, the respondent is thinking in terms of that specific course.)

10. Now, thinking back to last Fall when you registered for night school...

(a) Did you yourself pay any fees to attend night school? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

(b) Were you sponsored, or were part of your fees paid by someone else? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

(c) Were you <u>paid</u> to attend the course, or not? Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6

11. Which day of the week did your class meet? And at what time did the class begin?

DAY OF WEEK: TIME:	<u>SUN.</u>	<u>MON.</u>	<u>TUE.</u>	<u>WED.</u>	<u>THURS.</u>	<u>FRI.</u>	<u>SAT.</u>
5:30	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1	☐ 1
6:00	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2	☐ 2
6:30	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3	☐ 3
7:00	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4	☐ 4
7:30	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5	☐ 5
8:00	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6	☐ 6
8:30	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7	☐ 7

12. How long was each class? _____ Hours

13. And how many weeks was the course to last? _____ Weeks

14. (a) Before you registered for night school, did you discuss it with anyone?

Yes ☐ → Go to 14(b) No / Not Rem. ☐ → Go to 14(c)

(b) (i) <u>Who</u> did you discuss it with? <u>Who else</u> did you discuss it with?

<u>NOTE</u>: For replies such as "a friend" or "a guy at work," find out who that person is in relation to the respondent.

a. _____ c. _____

b. _____ d. _____

(ii) <u>For each person (a) above</u>:

What was his/her reaction to your going to night school?

	<u>FAVOURABLE</u>	<u>INDIFFERENT</u>	<u>UNFAVOURABLE</u>
a.	☐	☐	☐
b.	☐	☐	☐
c.	☐	☐	☐
d.	☐	☐	☐

(iii) Do you discuss other decisions with this same person (these same persons)?

Yes ☐ 1 ⟶ Go to (iv) No ☐ 2 ⟶ Go to 14(c)

(iv) What kinds of other problems do you discuss with him/her/them?

_____

_____

_____

(c) (i) What persons or groups of persons do you <u>often</u> talk with? Any other persons or groups you often talk with?

a. _____ c. _____

b. _____ d. _____

(ii) For each group or persons listed in (i) above, ask: Did _____ know you were going to night school (or know you were thinking of going to night school)?

a. Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 c. Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6
b. Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4 d. Yes ☐ 7 No ☐ 8

(iii) Where "yes" in (ii) above, ask:

What was (each person "yes" in (ii) above) his/her reaction to your going to night school?

	FAVOURABLE	INDIFFERENT	UNFAVOURABLE
a.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
b.	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6
c.	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9
d.	☐ 0	☐ X	☐ +

15. People give us all kinds of reasons for going to night school - sometimes very simple reasons, sometimes very complicated ones. Why did you decide to go to night school last fall? What else led you to register last fall? Are there any other reasons why you went to night school last fall?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD IN ORDER GIVEN: _____

_____

_____

16. About how long before you registered for night school had you been considering it?

One week or less	☐ 1	3 - 4 months	☐ 6
Two weeks	☐ 2	Longer	☐ 7
Three weeks	☐ 3		
One month	☐ 4	Other	_____
1 - 2 months	☐ 5		_____

17. (a) Did night school measure up to your expectations?

Yes ☐ 1 → Go to 18 No / Qualified ☐ 2 / ☐ 3 → Go to 17(b)

(b) How was it not what you had hoped?
Was there any other way it did not meet your expectations?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

_____

18. (a) Did the teacher measure up to your expectations or hopes?

Yes ☐ 1 → Go to 19 No / Qualified ☐ 2 / ☐ 3 → Go to 18(b)

(b) How did the teacher not measure up, in your opinion?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

_____

I have here a list of simple questions about the general situation in the night school you attended, and in particular the course in _____ for which you registered. Would you please just check off the answer which comes closest to your feeling on each question.

HAND RESPONDENT CLIPBOARD AND PENCIL, WITH QUESTION SHEET CLIPPED ON

19. A. How did you get along with the teacher?

Very well ☐ 1 Fairly well ☐ 2 Not very well ☐ 3

B. How did you get along with the students?

Very well ☐ 4 Fairly well ☐ 5 Not very well ☐ 6

C. Did the teacher treat you as adults in the class? Yes ☐ 7 No ☐ 8

LANGUAGE COURSES SKIP →

D. Did you have trouble understanding the language the teacher used to explain the subject? Yes ☐ 9 No ☐ 0

E. Did the teacher connect the course with interesting things outside the course? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

F. Did you find the subject matter of the course interesting? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

G. Did you find the subject matter of the course useful? Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6 20(G)

H. At the beginning of the course, did the teacher accurately explain what the course would include? Yes ☐ 7 No ☐ 8

I. Did the method of presentation used by the teacher make the subject interesting? Yes ☐ 9 No ☐ 0 20(I)

J. Did the teacher know the subject he was trying to teach? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

K. Did the teacher modify or change the course at all due to the needs, interests or requests of the class? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

L. What did you think of the content of the course?

Too basic, simple ☐ 5 Too advanced ☐ 6 About right ☐ 7

M. Did you readily understand the subject matter of the course? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 20(M)

N. Were each of the following satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Furniture in the rooms	☐ 1	☐ 2
Lighting in the rooms	☐ 3	☐ 4
Temperature in the rooms	☐ 5	☐ 6
Ventilation in the rooms	☐ 7	☐ 8
Teaching aids (e.g., films, equipment, apparatus, machines)	☐ 9	☐ 0

O. Were there adequate reference services for your needs - that is, books or people you could turn to for information or help in the course? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

P. Was the feeling in the classroom friendly? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

Q. Did you personally feel at home in the classroom environment? Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6

R. Did you get to know many of the students in your class? Yes ☐ 7 No ☐ 8

S. Was there any occasion when you felt left out? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 6

by teachers ☐ 2
by students ☐ 3
by both ☐ 4
by others ☐ 5

IF "NO" TO 19(G), ASK 20(G)

20. (G) In what ways was the subject matter of the course not useful?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

_____

IF "NO" TO 19(I), ASK 20(I)

20. (I) In your opinion, how could the method of presentation have been improved so as to make the course more interesting?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

_____

IF "NO" TO 19(M), ASK 20(M)

20. (M) I see you had some difficulty in readily understanding some of the subject matter. What did you think of the subject matter of the course in this regard?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

_____

21. If you were absent from a class, did anyone phone you or inquire about your absence?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

(If respondent was never absent, ask question as... "If you had been absent, do you think someone would have phoned or inquired?" etc.)

22. Were you able to catch up after you missed a class? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

(If respondent never missed, ask as... "If you had missed a class, do you think you would have been able to catch up?")

DROPOUTS

23. Why did you stop attending the course in _____?

What other factors caused you to stop this course?

Were there any other reasons - even small ones - involved in your giving up the course in (course) ?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD IN ORDER GIVEN: _____

_____

24. (a) Had you attended night classes before last fall? Yes ☐ 1 - ask 24(b)
No ☐ 2 - go to 25

(b) Did you complete these previous courses? Yes ☐ 3 - go to 25
No ☐ 4 - ask 24(c)
Qualified ☐ 5 - ask 24(c)

(c) How did it happen that you were unable to complete these previous courses?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

25. How long did you attend the course in _____ last fall and winter?

One week	☐ 1
Two weeks	☐ 2
3 - 4 weeks	☐ 3
5 - 8 weeks	☐ 4
10 - 12 weeks	☐ 5
14 - 20 weeks	☐ 6
Longer	☐ 7

26. After attending for that length of time, did you feel you had achieved what you set out to achieve?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

27. Did you begin to study for the course before you registered for night school?

Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

28. Do you thing it would be worthwhile to provide some preparation before a night school course begins?

Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6

29. Do you plan to take other courses to continue your education? Yes ☐ 7
No ☐ 8

30. Do you feel that night classes help you, or that they cannot help you meet your own objectives?

Help ☐ 9 Cannot help ☐ 0

31. (a) Are you doing any studying "on your own" at the present time? Yes ☐ X - ask 31(b)
No ☐ +

(b) What are you studying? _____

_____

32. (a) Were there other people in your class in (course) who quit the course?

Yes ☐ 1 - ask 32(b) No ☐ 2 - ask 33

(b) Why did they quit? What other reasons caused them to stop taking the course?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

33. (a) Were any of your friends going to night school with you? Yes ☐ 1 - ask 33(b)
No ☐ 2 - go to 34

(b) Did your friends complete their courses? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

34. (a) Did you discuss leaving this night school course with anyone?

Yes ☐ 1 - ask 34(b) No ☐ 2 - go to 46

(b) Who did you discuss it with? Relationship: 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

STAY-INS

35. Did you ever feel fed up with night school? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

36. (a) Did you ever think of quitting? Yes ☐ 3 - Ask 36(b), 36(c)
No ☐ 4 - Go to 37

(b) What made you continue? _____

_____

(c) Did you discuss quitting with anyone? Yes ☐ 5 - Ask 36(d)
No ☐ 6 - Go to 37

(d) Who did you discuss it with? Relationship: 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(e) What was (each person listed in (d) above)'s reaction to your thinking of quitting night school?

	FAVOURABLE TO QUITTING	INDIFFERENT	UNFAVOURABLE TO QUITTING
1.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3
2.	☐ 4	☐ 5	☐ 6
3.	☐ 7	☐ 8	☐ 9

37. This past school year - did you get enough time to study? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

38. Do you plan to take other courses to continue your education? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

39. Did you begin to study for the course before you registered for night school? Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6

40. Do you think it would be worthwhile to provide some kind of preparation before a night school course begins? Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

41. (a) Are you doing any studying "on your own" at the present time?

Yes ☐ 3 - Ask 41(b) No ☐ 4 - Go to 42

(b) What are you studying? _____

_____

42. (a) Had you attended night classes before this present school year?

Yes ☐ 1 - Ask 42(b) No ☐ 2 - Go to 43

(b) Did you complete previous courses? Yes ☐ 3 - Go to 43 No ☐ 4 - Ask 42(c)

42. (c) How did it happen that you did not finish a previous course? _____

_____

43. Let's suppose that some of your friends quit a course that you were enjoying. Would you consider quitting too?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 Qualified ☐ 3

44. (a) Were there people in your class in (course) this year who quit the course?

Yes ☐ 1 - Ask 44(b) No ☐ 2 - Go to 45

(b) Why did they quit? What other reasons caused them to stop taking the course?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

45. (a) Were any of your friends going to night school with you?

Yes ☐ 1 - Ask 45(b) No ☐ 2 - G to 46

(b) Did your friends complete their courses? Yes ☐ 3 No ☐ 4

(c) When was the last class you attended in this course?

Month _____ First Half ☐ Last Half ☐

46. How do you think night school could be improved? _____

_____

_____

47. How do you think night school should be changed so as to keep people from quitting courses?

_____

_____

48. What level of formal education did you complete before joining night school last fall:

Public or grade school	☐ 1
Part of high or technical school	☐ 2
Finished high or technical school	☐ 3
Part of university or college	☐ 4
Graduated from university or college	☐ 5
Graduate or professional studies after graduation	☐ 6

49. How old were you when you left school? _____ Years

50. Why did you stop going to school when you did?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

51. What was the most important single thing that happened to you in school?

RECORD WORD-FOR-WORD: _____

_____

52. How successful were you in school? Would you say you were... (read list)

Excellent?	☐	1
Good?	☐	2
Average?	☐	3
Below Average?	☐	4

53. Did you ever fail a grade? Yes ☐ 5 No ☐ 6

54. Now - the last section. This is a series of questions which I would like you to fill in privately. Be sure you answer them all, then I would like you to seal them in this envelope.

For each of the statements, we would like to know whether you are inclined to agree, or whether you are inclined to disagree. If you agree just a little bit, write in the number "1". If you agree quite a bit, write in "2" and if you agree a great deal, write in "3".

The same applies if you disagree with the statement. Put in "1" under "disagree" if you disagree just a little, "2" if you disagree quite a bit, and "3" if you disagree with the statement "a great deal."

NOTE: BE SURE RESPONDENT UNDERSTANDS, THEN GIVE HIM/HER CLIPBOARD AND PENCIL.

Then explain that the income question on the end of sheet is used in our calculations of the opinions of different groups. It is located on that sheet so as to ensure privacy and because it is important that we know the category.

	Agree		Disagree
	1.	Just a little	1.
	2.	Quite a bit	2.
	3.	A great deal	3.

54. i) I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job ____ ____

ii) I know who is responsible for most of my troubles ____ ____

iii) My family does not like the work I have chosen, or the work I intend to choose for my life work ____ ____

iv) My school grades were a fairly accurate reflection of my ability ____ ____

v) No one seems to understand me ____ ____

vi) I feel that it is best to keep my mouth shut when I am in class at night school ____ ____

vii) My parents and family find more fault with me than they should ____ ____

viii) I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken ____ ____

ix) I feel like giving up quickly when things go wrong ____ ____

x) I usually work things out for myself, rather than get someone to show me how ____ ____

xi) People can pretty easily change me, even though I thought that my mind was already made up on a subject ____ ____

xii) The person who had most to do with me when I was a child (i.e. Father, Mother, etc.) was very strict with me ____ ____

xiii) There is very little love and companionship in my family as compared to other homes ____ ____

xiv) I frequently find myself worrying about something ____ ____

xv) I usually expect to succeed in things I do ____ ____

xvi) I have several times given up doing a thing because I thoughttoo little of my ability ____ ____

Into which of the following categories does the total annual income of all members of your household fall?

Under $1,000	☐	$4,000 - 4,999	☐	$8,000 - 9,999	☐
$1,000 - 1,999	☐	$5,000 - 5,999	☐	$10,000 and over	☐
$2,000 - 2,999	☐	$6,000 - 6,999	☐		
$3,000 - 3,999	☐	$7,000 - 7,999	☐		

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAY 11 1968
on Adult Education